THE EVOLUTION

OF

MALAYALAM MORPHOLOGY.

BY

L. V. RAMASWAMI AYYAR, M. A., B. L.,

Maharaja's College, Ernakulam.

THE EVOLUTION

OF

MALAYALAM MORPHOLOGY.

BY

L. V. RAMASWAMI AYYAR, M. A., B. L.,

Maharaja's College, Ernakulam.

ERNAKULAM.

PRINTED AT THE COCHIN GOVERNMENT PRESS.

1936.

THE EVOLUTION

OF

MALAYALAM MORPHOLOGY

THE EVOLUTION

OF

MALAYALAM MORPHOLOGY.

BY

L. V. RAMASWAMI AYYAR, M. A., B. L.,

Maharaja's College, Ernakulam.

ERNAKULAM.

PRINTED AT THE COCHIN GOVERNMENT PRESS.

1936.

Published by
The Rama Varma Research Institute Committee,
Trichur.

CONTENTS

	Pages.
Preface	vii—ix
Detailed Contents	xi—xvii
Transliteration	xix
Introduction	1— 4
Chapter I—Nominal Inflexions	5— 31
,, II—Demonstratives	32— 34
,, III—Pronouns	35— 37
,, IV—Verbs	38—104
,, V—Miscellaneous Malayalam Formations	105—113
,, VI—The Language of some Malayalam classics	114—138
,, VII—Affiliations	139—148
Bibliography	149—152
Key to Abbreviations	153—155

PREFACE.

An attempt is made in this monograph to study the evolution of the morphology of Malayāḷam with the help of the data furnished by inscriptions and literary texts.

Though descriptive accounts of Malayāḷam are available in Gundert's "Grammar of the Mal. language" (published in 1868) and in A. R. Raja Raja Varma's Keraḷa Pāṇinīyam (*2nd edition*), a detailed historical survey (embodying illustrations from inscriptions and texts) of the evolution of the grammatical features of Mal. has so far remained a desideratum. Gundert, one of the pioneers in the study of Mal. grammar, did indeed occasionally advert in his work to the origin of some of the grammatical forms; but his handling of the historical aspects was necessarily inadequate and imperfect in view of the fact that many important classics (*e. g.* Uṇṇunīlīsandeśam, Līlātilakam, the Niraṇam works and the campus) and several inscriptions were not available in his time. Quite a large number of historical aspects are envisaged in Kerāḷa Pāṇinīyam (which was at once historical and analytical in its treatment); but the scope of that *magnum opus* was far too wide to admit of the possibility of the historical side being worked out in full on a chronological basis with reference to texts and inscriptions.

The influence of tradition has always been strong in Mal., and in the earlier stages the tempo of evolution was not the same in all areas; hence it sometimes happens that texts which chronologically belong to later periods, preserve forms mirroring earlier stages of evolution. Barring instances of this type, the gradual development of forms could be traced from period to period in literature and in inscriptions.

A historical survey, like the present one, cannot avoid discussing origins. I have had, therefore, to outline a number of

perspectives in the course of this essay; but in doing so, I have as far as possible allowed the facts to speak for themselves and yield the inferences. Chief among such new perspectives outlined here are those relating to the origin of the "qualificatory" ғ [Ch. I, § 10], the unique Mal. tense with ū [Ch. IV, § 6] and the Mal. negatives embodying tense-affixes [Ch. IV, § 14].

I hope that Ch. VI which groups together under separate headings the specialities of the morphology of some of the prominent Mal. classics, and Ch. VII which treats about the question of affinities,—a question about which unfortunately hazy and unscientific notions still prevail,—will be found useful.

The importance of the comparative study of the Dravidian languages is increasingly recognized today; but the condition precedent to all comparative studies is that the individual speeches themselves should first be analysed both from the historical and the descriptive standpoints. I venture to hope that the present monograph will be useful not only to students of Malayāḷam but also to a wider circle of Indianists interested in comparative linguistic studies.

The documentation may appear to be somewhat forbiddingly elaborate; but since this work is the first of its kind, the detailed references to the sources will, I trust, not be found superfluous.

I know that definitive editions are lacking for some of the classical works in Malayāḷam; but I have taken care to embody in this essay only such illustrations as repeatedly crop up in different works or recur in different contexts in the course of the same work.

The printing of this book has by no means been an easy task. Some of the symbols [dental n'; alveolar t',d'] had to be improvised. The compositors were unused to the work of

handling diacritics, and the proof-sheets had to be corrected several times before the formes could be made ready for the machine. But the unfailing courtesy of the Superintendent of the Government Press, Mr. N. M. Parameswara Ayyar, considerably lightened my task of piloting the work through the Press, and I take this opportunity to thank him for the facilities that he placed at my disposal in this connection.

My thanks are also due to the Rama Varma Research Institute Committee for the kind readiness with which my work was accepted for publication.

Ernakulam,
25th April 1936.

L. V. RAMASWAMI AYYAR.

CONTENTS

Pages.

INTRODUCTION. 1—4

The threefold object of this monograph.—

The importance and value of certain Mal. texts for the study of linguistic change.—

The periods:— I. Old Mal.— (a) Early Old Mal. (b) The pāṭṭu era (c) The early maṇipravāḷa period (d) The campu era.—

II. New Mal.— (a) Transitional New Mal. [Eḻuttaššan]. (b) Early New Mal. [Keraḷa Varma, Kōṭṭayattu, etc.] (c) Middle New Mal. [Kuñjan, Rāmapuṟattu, Uṇṇāyi, Kallēṅguḷaṅṅare, etc.] (d) Late New Mal. [Kōyittamburān, etc.]

CHAPTER I.

NOMINAL INFLEXIONS. 5—31

1. Bases and their peculiarities in Mal. [as contrasted with literary Tamil].— Incorporation of glides, both front and back.—Embodiment of the enunciative after cilluguḷ.—Forms assumed by vāy, kāy, pāy, n'āy in Mal.

2. The "second" case.— Its origin.— Peculiarities of accusative concord.

3. The "third" case.—Mal. āl corresponds to Middle Tam. āl and not to Old Tam. ān.—Use of ōḍu for separation or viyogah in RC, Niraṇam works KG and even in Eḻ.

4. The "fourth" case.— The origin of Mal. -nu, -nnu. The early rise of the demarcation in Mal. of the so-called- nu datives and the -ku datives. The rules regulating this demarcation.

5. The "fifth" case.— The immediate relationship of Mal. -il-n'in'n'u to Middle Tam. il-n'inṟu, as distinct from Old Tam. -in.

Pages.

The contractions īn'n'-, -n'n'-, etc.—The "abnormal" use of the fifth case concord for "fearing".

6. The genitive.— Origin of Maḷ.(n)d'e. Its immediate relationship to Early Middle Tam. uḍai which is absent as a genitive in Old Tam.—The stages of the development of Mal.(n)d'e.—Earliest textual illustrations in US.

7. The locative.— Mal. il corresponds directly to Middle Tam. il.—Mal. -kal, -(in)-kal derivable from kāl.

8. The vocative.—The origin and history of uḷḷōyē, uḷḷōvē, irippōvē.—The sambodhana eḍō in Old and New Mal.

9. Directive endings.— The datival directive of Dravidian. Its peculiarities in Mal.— The use of പെട്ട' peṭṭu as a directive suffix. മേല്പോട്ട് mēlpōṭṭu, പടിഞ്ഞാറോട്ട് paḍiññāṛōṭṭu, കരോട്ട്, karōṭṭu etc.—Directives with നോക്കി n'ōkki.— ആയ്ക്കൊണ്ടു āykkoṇḍu and ആമ്മാറു āmmāṛu used directively.

10 The qualificatory ē of Mal. in (i) കാട്ടിലേ ആന kāṭṭilē āna, ഗൃഹത്തിങ്കലേ ഐശ്വര്യം gṛhattiṅgalē aiśvaryam; (ii) ദൂരത്തേ വീട്ടിൽ dūrattē vīṭṭil; (iii) പിന്നേത്തേക്കോപ്പു pinnēttē-k-kōppu; (iv) കോഴിക്കോട്ടേ സഭ kōḻikkōṭṭē-s-sabha; (vi) നാട്ടാരേ വീട്ടിൽ n'āṭṭāṛē vīṭṭil.—The origin of these types.

11. The "loose" postpositions.— കുറിച്ചു kuṛiccu, പററി paṯṯi, തൊട്ട് toṭṭu, ആയ് āy, ആയ്ക്കൊണ്ട് āykkoṇḍu, ആയിട്ട് āyiṭṭu, പക്കൽ pakkal and പോക്കൽ pōkkal, ഇട iḍa, ഉടേ ūḍē, അണയത്തു aṇiyattu, ചാരത്തു cārattu, ഏൽ [<മേൽ mēl] -ēl, etc.— Early Middle Tamil postpositions compared.

12. Comparisonal endings.— Older -il and kāṭṭil form parts of the heritage of Mal.— kāḷ, kāḷil, kāyil, kāṇa are developments in Mal.

13. Augments.— Peculiarities of Mal. augments. —Importance of the presence or absence of the augment-

Pages.

in- for the early differentiation of the so-called Mal. -n(u) datives.—Other Mal. augments:—am-, the nasal, -aṯṯ-, -iṯṯ-, -att-.—Differences between Tamil and Mal. in the use of augments.

14. Plural formations.—The use of kaḷ for "rationals," a feature of Early Middle Tam.—ക്കന്മാർ -kkanmār of രാജാക്കന്മാർ rājākkanmār, etc. owes its -n- to analogy with instances like araśanmār, where n is normal.

മാർകൾ mārgaḷ as a plural ending—പാമ്പന്മാർ pāmbanmār, പരന്തന്മാർ parandanmār and വണ്ടന്മാർ vaṇḍanmār in Old Mal.—The history of the forms ആണുങ്ങൾ āṇuṅṅaḷ and പെണ്ണുങ്ങൾ peṇṇuṅṅaḷ beside ആങ്ങൾ āṅṅaḷ (a) and പെങ്ങൾ peṅṅaḷ.—പോത്തങ്ങൾ pōttaṅṅal in BhBh.—Epicene Plurals.—n'ālvar, aivar, eṇmar; magaḷar in Naiṣ. camp and in Eḷ.—The ending kārar,- kkāṟar and-kkār.

CHAPTER II.

DEMONSTRATIVES. 32—34

Gundert's doubtful identification of Mal. ഊടു ūdu in instances like പറവൂടും ചെയ്തു paṟavūdum ceydu or പറഞ്ഞൂടു paraññūdu with the Dravidian intermediate demonstrative ū.—

The chief differences between Mal. and Tam. in the use of the demonstratives:— Mal· uses them before qualifying relative participles, as in ഇക്കണ്ടരൂപത്തിൽ i-k-kaṇḍa rūpattil.—Mal. has an ungeminated -v- in Mal. അവിടെ aviḍe, ഇവിടെ iviḍe, ഇവണ്ണം ivaṇṇam, ഇവാറു ivāṟu, etc., beside Tam. a-vv-iḍam, etc.— Mal. lacked altogether the Tam. sandhi forms like av-yānai.— Free use in Mal. [both the literary and the colloquial dialects] of the lengthened demonstratives ā and ī, while these in Tamil are restricted to poetry according to Tolkāppiyam col.— iv-ellām.—The expletive ഇടു idu of Mal. appearing in poetry after tense-forms of all persons, genders and numbers.—palavum and paladum.

Pages.

CHAPTER III.

PRONOUNS. 35—37

Most Mal. pronouns developed from forms corresponding to those of Middle Tamil.— A few distinctive forms.— The first personal forms.—n'in-, the inflexional "oblique", archaic in the west coast.—The history of ഞാങ്ങൾ ñāṅṅaḷ, ഞങ്ങൾ ñaṅṅaḷ and എങ്ങൾ eṅṅaḷ.— The history of tān and tām in Mal.—The special uses of tān in Mal.

CHAPTER IV.

VERBS. 38—104

1. Bases.— Those unique in Mal. with no direct counterparts in Tamil.— Mal. verb-bases with structural modifications.—Bases with semantic variations.— Compound bases.— The history of കാല്ക്കവാ— Unique verb-forms of al, il. — അറുതു arudu and its semantic developments in Mal.— Conjugational forms of arudu.—ഉൾ uḷ and its forms in Mal.—The varied uses of ഉണ്ടു uṇḍu in Mal.— The evolution of modern colloquial എടാണ്ടു ēdāṇḍu, etc. from older ēdānum- uṇḍu, etc., attested in KG, BhBh and Eḷ.—വൽ val, ഒൽ ol and their forms in Old and New Mal.— Old Mal. verb-forms of en- 'to say' with the primary meaning.— Forms of en- in New Mal.—Specialities of the forms of āg in Mal.— Old Mal. bases not met with in New Mal.— Old Mal. transitive verbs ഉയർക്ക uyaṛ-kk-, താഴ്ക്ക tāḷkk-, പെടുക്ക peḍu-kk-, വളർക്ക valaṛ-kk-, അമർക്ക amaṛ-kk-, നിറെക്ക n'irai-kk-, ചുവറ്റ cuvatt-, വിടുർക്ക viḍuṛ-kk-.— Mal. causatives and their immediate affinities toMiddle Tam.— Absence of vi- causatives in Old. Tam.

2. Personal endings for tense-forms.—Instances of the lack of personal endings in US, Līl., RC, Niraṇam works, KG and Eḷ.—Types of personal endings in US, Niraṇam works, KG and Eḷ.—General remarks regarding the gradual disappearance of personal endings in Mal.

Pages.

3. The present tense.— Evolution of ഉന്നു -un'n'- < -in'n' < -ind'- <-g- ind' corresponding to the Early Middle Tam.-gind'.—gind'. absent in Old Tam.—Mal. present tense ending definitely derived from a stage corresponding to Early Middle Tam.—ā-n'ind' of the Paṇikkars and of the earliest inscriptions only a Tamilism.

4. The past tense.—Special Mal. peculiarities.—വാണ്ണ് vāṇṇ-, വാണ് vāṇ-,etc.: ṇ < ṇṇ < ṇd.—Different past stems for some bases.—കൊന്നു conn- in KG.—The graphic representations കൊണ്ടു cond' and വന്ദു vand' -due to "popular" etymology.—History of എഴുന്നേറ്റു—eḻun'ēṭṭ—with reference to older എഴുന്നിന്നു eḻun'in'n'- ["confusion" with ഏറ്റു ēṭṭ- of ēlkk-].— Types of past forms like മടങ്ങിയാൻ madaṅṅiyān and ചൊല്ലിയേൻ colliyēn, in Bh Bh, Eḷ.

5. The future tense—With ഉം um.—Evolution of its use for all numbers and persons in Mal.—The future with personal endings.

6. The aorist with ഊ ū or (v)ū.—Its structure.—Its syntactic functions.—Its deeprootedness in Mal.—How far the type is represented in modern Mal.—Origin of this type.—

7. The infinitive participle.—The older type.—Its history in Mal. traced from the earliest period down till today.—The "purpose" participle with -vān,- mān,- ppān.—A useful type which cropped up in Early Middle Tam.—Different syntactic significations in Mal. for this type.

8. The relative participles.—Peculiar forms like ഇട്ടനശാപം iṭṭana śāpam in RC.—Poetic type തിങ്ങിന tiṅṅina, വന്നീടിന van'n'īdina never active in Mal. colloquial which has തിങ്ങിയ tiṅṅiya. etc.—Compounds of the rel. participles with other forms, serving particular syntactic functions.

9. Conditionals and concessives.—Mal. -gil.—Origin of-g-in -g-il.—ūl-um and its probable origin.—ആനും ānum,

Pages.

എനും ēnum, ഏലും ēlum.—ആരാൻ āran sometimes used as a noun base.—Origin of വാൻ vān in ആരുവാൻ āruvān, എന്തുവാൻ enduvān—

10. Verbal nouns with-ga,-kka.—The extensive uses to which these are put in Mal.—How these are declined in the instrumental, the locative, rarely in the accusative and more rarely still in the dative.

11. Imperatives.—Mere base.—Embodiment of-kk-for kārita bases, particularly in New Mal.—The polite imperative derived from the older optative—The pl. with -vin,-ppin.—The Tamilisms kēḷāy, kāṇīr, etc.—Future participial nouns used with an imperative force.—The benedictive with āga.—The forms with -ṭṭē.—The type of ceydālum—The permissive with -ām.—Imperatives of the type of കൊൾവൂ koḷvū.—Tamilisms of the type of വരുവോയാക varuvōyāga.

12. Participial nouns.—The types വന്നോൻ van'n'ōn and വന്നവൻ van'n'avan.—Use of participials almost like finites in certain texts.

13. Appellatives.—Only third personal appellatives are common in Mal.—Old അടിയേൻ aḍiyēn and Kaṇṇaśśan's Tamilism എല്ലീരും ellīrum.—

എന്നോൻ eññōn, എന്നോൾ eññōḷ, അന്നനാട്ടോൻ aññanattōn, സിംഹത്താൻ simhattān, നാഗത്താൻ nāgattān, നാട്ടർ n'āṭṭār, etc.

14. Negative verb-forms.— The old aoristic type with personal endings, frequent in Old Mal. works becomes less and less popular till at the time of Eḷ only the type ceyyā which has in Mal. invaded the province of all persons and numbers is left in use.—Special Mal. type formed upon the type ചെയ്യാ(യ്) ceyyā with tense-endings.—Classifications of the forms of this type.—The only forms popular today are the verbal noun and the representatives of the past.—Derivation of these negative forms.—Other Mal. negative formations, old and new.

Page.s.

CHAPTER V.

MISCELLANEOUS. 105—113

1. ഓളം ōḷam and its evolution in Mal.
2. ഇൻറി ind'i, ഇൻറിയെ ind'i·y-ē, ഇന്നിയെ, in'n'iyē, ഏന്യെ.
3. മതി madi and മതിപോരും madipōrum.
4. etṛa, atṛa, itṛa.
5. History of ഒരിക്കൽ orikkal.
6. The conditional finite tense with-ēnē and ēnāyirun'n'u.
7. The particles e ē, ō, ā in Mal.

CHAPTER VI.

THE MORPHOLOGY OF SOME MAL. CLASSICS. 114—138

1. Morphological peculiarities in Uṇṇun'īlisandeśam.
2. " " Niraṇam works
3. " " Campu Mal.
4. " " Kṛṣṇagātha.
5. " " Eḻuttaśśan.

CHAPTER VII.

AFFILIATIONS. 139—148

1. Mal. and Tam.
2. Mal. and Early Middle Tam.
3. A few unique features of Mal. morphology.
4. Affiliations.

TRANSLITERATION.

The system of notation popularised by the Royal Asiatic Society has been adopted for the transliteration of sounds in this book, with the following additions:—

n'—dental nasal [As the dental nasal in Mal. is a separate phoneme independent of the alveolar n, a separate symbol has to be adopted. The only satisfactory symbol that could be improvised in this Press is n']

t'—breathed alveolar plosive.

d'—voiced alveolar plosive.

ṛ—the cerebral ṛ of Mal., slightly, trilled.

ɯ—the unrounded, back, closed Tam. vowel appearing in final positions of words.

ə—the Mal. representative of Tam. ɯ—a mixed, half-closed or half-open vowel.

[For the sake of convenience, I have used only the symbol u in this essay to represent these two last-mentioned sounds]

THE EVOLUTION
OF
MALAYĀḶAM MORPHOLOGY

By

L. V. RAMASWAMI AIYAR, M. A., B. L.

(*Maharaja's College, Ernakulam.*)

INTRODUCTION.

The object of the present paper is threefold :—

(a) to mark off the beginnings of the morphology of Mal. grammar from the parent stage with reference to the earliest inscriptions and texts ;

(b) to determine the relationship of Mal. features to those of the parent speech and to distinguish the unique characteristics of Mal. morphology ;

(c) to trace the evolution of morphological features from period to period, and to classify the chief linguistic characteristics of the different periods.

I am concerned in this essay only with the beginnings and the evolution of Morphology. Neither Phonology nor Syntax falls directly within the scope of this essay except in so far as they are useful to illustrate or explain points of morphology. I have already dealt with some of the more important aspects of Phonology in my "Grammar in Līlātilakam" and in my "Primer of Mal. Phonology"; and the treatment of the development of Mal. syntax has to be reserved for a separate paper.

So far as the affinities of Mal. to other Dravidian languages are concerned, I may state at once the conclusion that has been irresistibly borne in on me by the facts set out in my essay:—

(i) Most of the morphological features are nearest related to those of Early Middle Tamil.

(ii) Many of them are derivable phonetically and historically from Early Middle Tamil.

(iii) A few unique features do exist in Mal.; and one or two of these may have been archaisms preserved in the west coast colloquial.

In my paper on the "Morphology of the Old Tamil Verb" I have indicated that there exists more or less a sharp linguistic cleavage between the language of the Śaṅgam works and that of the Tamil writers [the Vaiṣṇavite Aḻwars and the Saivite saints] from about the 5th century onwards. Śaṅgam Tamil may be conveniently described as Old Tamil, and the post-5th century Tamil as Middle Tamil. Tolkāppiyam Colladigāram embodies the rules of Old Tamil grammar, while the eleventh century Vīracōḻīyam and the thirteenth century Nannūl contemplate the particular usages of Middle Tamil also. It is with reference to this cleavage between Śaṅgam Tamil or Old Tamil on the one hand and, on the other, Early Middle Tamil [from about the 5th century to about the 10th century] that the features of Mal. morphology have been examined here; and I may say at once that such an examination reveals very clearly a remarkable closeness of affinity for Mal. to Early Middle Tamil. There are a few features of Mal. morphology which may be described as archaic, but even these are nearer related to Tamil than to any other Dravidian speech. Most features of Mal. morphology are either most nearly allied to, or derivable from, a stage of speech corresponding to Early Middle Tamil. For details, I would refer the reader to the section on "Affiliations of Mal." in Chapter VI below.

In composing this treatise, I have consulted all the chief available published west coast inscriptions and the important printed literary texts. Though the date of composition of Rāmacaritam is controversial, there is little doubt that it contains quite a large number of transitional forms of interest to the student of Mal. linguistics. The value of the works of the Niraṇam Paṇikkars need certainly not be underestimated merely because they have employed some Tamilisms [see chapter VI] in their works. While the usefulness, to the student of the Mal. language, of the early maṇipravāḷas, of Līlātilakam and of Kṛṣṇa gātha would be generally recognized, the unique importance of the fifteenth or sixteenth century prose version of the Bhāgavatam

[the daśama skandha has been published in the Srī Mūlam granthāvali series, and portions of other skandhas in the Prācīna Grantha Mālā, edited by Prince Appan Tamburān] deserves special emphasis. It is true that in syntax and in vocabulary the translator or translators have been enormously influenced by Sanskrit, but the work also bristles with unique Old Mal. forms.

Not less valuable is the evidence of the Mal. portions of the campus, particularly of the Mal. gadyas some of which abound in "communal" colloquialisms of a more or less archaic character.

I mark off the following linguistic periods for Mal.

1. The Beginnings of Mal.—The exact limits are difficult to ascertain. The usual opinion that the 10th century marks the end of this epoch need not be absolute in view of the fact that Mal. may have developed and popularised its characteristic linguistic features even before the 10th century in the colloquials of the west coast. This development which (I may incidentally observe) need not have been uniform in all areas of Malabar, was perhaps given the sanction of "dignified" usage only from about the 9th or 10th century.

2. Old Mal.—The lower limit may conveniently be fixed as the 16th century. The following sub-divisions are more or less conspicuous.

(a) Early Old Mal. [till the 12th or the 13th century].—This was the period when the literary tradition was still dominantly subject to the sway of Tamil conventions. This is the period, *par excellence*, of the form described as pāṭṭu in Līl.

(b) Early Maṇipravāḷa period [till the end of 14th century], marked by the phenomenal influence of Sanskrit in all the various directions pointed out by Līl.

(c) The campu period [till the 16th century], in which the influence of Sanskrit continued to assert itself though in the sphere of language it was shorn of the bizarre Samskṛtīkṛtabhāṣā forms of the early maṇipravāḷa period,

Though I have indicated above the *dominant* characteristics of each of the sub-divisions, it should not be supposed that these are chronologically exclusive. For instance, it is very likely that the influence of Sanskrit and that of the Tamil literary conventions coexisted in Malabar from the earliest times. The works of the Niraṇam Paṇikkars who use many Tamilisms (presumably out of deference partly to a regional speech and partly to a literary tradition current at the time) were written in the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, after the early maṇipravāḷa Kāvya Uṇṇunīlisandeśa. Again, Kṛṣṇa Gātha and Ceruśśēri Bhāratam,—works free from any abnormal influence of either Sanskrit or Tamil,—appear to have been written in the fifteenth century—a period when some of the most important Mal. campu prabhandhas with their Sanskritic flair and usages were also composed.

In marking off the periods, therefore, under the captions "Pāṭṭu period", "Early Maṇipravāḷa period", etc., what is contemplated is only the dominant literary influence of the time, as reflected in some of the chief productions.

3. New. Mal. [From the 16th century to the present day]

(a) Transitional New Mal.: the period of Eḻuttaśśan.

(b) Early New Mal.— Pūndānam, Keraḷa Varma Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇam, Kōṭṭayattu Tamburān. [16th and 17th centuries]

(c) Middle New Mal.— The period of Kuñjan, Uṇṇāyi, Rāmapurattu and Kallēṇgulaññare. [18th century]

(d) Late New Mal.— From Valia Kōyittamburān to the present day. [19th century and early 20th century]

CHAPTER I—NOMINAL INFLECTIONS.

1. BASES.

1. The constant embodiment of vocalic glides with noun bases in inflexional positions between the final vowels of the bases and the initial vowels of inflexions or of the augments has led to the semi-permanent incorporation of these glides in the bases when these bases are immediately followed by pauses, or by other words or postpositions having initial consonants.

(a) The front *y*, followed by the enunciative:—

തീയ് tīyu [Bh Bh, 1, p. 76]

	കയ്യ് kayyu	[Bh Bh, 2, p. 31]
	കയ്യുകൾ kayyugaḷ	
beside	കൈകൾ kaigaḷ	

നീയ്യ് nīyyu [before a pause] Pr Gr Bh, p. 52

(b) The back *v*, followed by the enunciative:—

നടുവ് naḍuvu [RC]; മാവ് māvu, പൂവ് pūvu [L III, 12, comm.], മറുവ maṛuvu [L, III, 4, comm.] വടുവ് vaḍuvu [B] പൂവുകൾ pūvugaḷ [B]; the following adaptations from Skt:—രാഹുവ് rāhuvu [KR, Kiṣk., 332]; വായുവ് vāyuvu [KR., Sund.], ഗോവുകൾ gōvugaḷ beside gōkkaḷ [B]; രാജാവ rājāvu, ഭർത്താവ bhaṛttāvu, കർത്താവ kaṛttāvu, etc.

Literary Tamil does not allow the incorporation of *y* and *v* in these contexts i. e. before pauses or consonants following.

In Mal. however, this has been expressly "sanctioned" by Līl. III, 4 and 12 comm.

The incorporation of these sounds is common in the texts and in the modern colloquial; but rāhuvu and vāyuvu cited above from KR do not have v-u to-day, though rājāvu, kaṛttāvu are quite common.

In old compounds, even when the second constituent has an initial consonant, the glide and the enunciative do not appear:

kai kāryam, kai-k-koḷ-, pū-k-kottu, naḍu-k-kuttu, tī-k-kanal, mai-k-kaṇṇi.

2. Before pauses and before consonants following, monosyllabic noun bases with final l, ḷ, ṉ, n, r [for some of the rules guiding this feature, see my DS] optionally incorporate the enunciative u [1] [ə] in Mal.

കണ്ണുകൾ Kaṉṉu-gaḷ, കണ്ണുനീർ Kaṉṉu-ṅīr beside കണ്ണീർ Kaṉ-ṉīr, കാലുകൾ, Kālu-gaḷ beside കാൽകൾ Kāl-gaḷ [KR, Sund., 7], ആറ് āru, പുല്ലു മുളച്ചു pullu muḷaccu [Bh Bh, 1, p. 77]

Lil. III, 24 provides for this divergence of Mal. from literary Tamil. Colloquial Tamil, literary Telugu and Middle and Modern Kann. incorporate the enunicative always in such circumstances [See my DS].

It may be observed that in old word-compunds like പുൽത്തൈലം pul-t-tailam, പോർക്കളം pōr-k-kaḷam, കൺനോവ് kaṉ-ṉōvu, കാൽത്തളം kāl-t-taḷam, ആൽത്തറ āl-t-tara, കാൽ കൈ തോൾ kāl kai tōḷ [KR, Sund., 210], the absolute consonantal character of these cillugaḷ [ചില്ലുകൾ] is preserved.

3. Literary Tamil noun-bases vāy, ṅāy, kāy, pāy show in Mal. the following forms.—

(i) vāy, etc. in old Mal. as in Tam.

The old writers generally use these bases which are also heard to-day in regional colloquials of Malabar.

(ii) vā, ṅā, kā, and pā, with the final-y dropped before initial consonants of words following :—

വാ വിട്ടു vā viṭṭu [Rāj.]; [KR, Kiṣk., 112]

നാ നരി ṅā ṅāri [Bh Bh, 1, p. 36]

നാ തൊടുമോ ṅa toḍumō [Rām camp., SP]

വാ കീറിക്കൊണ്ടു vā kīri-k-koṅṅu [Eḷ Bh]

കാ കരികൾ kā karigaḷ [cf., however, kāy kanigaḷ in K R, Sund., 89].,

പാ മരം pā maram

(1) The incorporation of the enunciative is common in Tamil colloquial from a very early period, since constructions like നെല്ലുഴുവ് nellu occur in Middle Tam. inscriptions [cf. SII, II, p 253 ff.—10th century]. In Mal., this feature appears to have received literary recognition, though instances like കാൽ കൈ തോൾ [K R, Sund., 210] continued to exist.

It will be observed from the illustrations that the elision of the final-y is due here to the fact that the words concerned are so intimately associated with phrases or words following, as to become almost "compounded" with them.

In modern regional colloquials, pā, kā, and vā 'mouth' are often heard before consonants and pauses.

(iii) The forms appear as vāy-a, ṅāya, kāya and pāya in some modern colloquials invariably before pauses, often before initial consonants of other words following and occasionally showing -a [slightly modified to a "neutral" sound] in genitives like കായടെ വില kāyaḍe vila, വായടെ നാററം vāyaḍe ṅāṯṯam, പായടെ മേലെ pāyaḍe mēle, and in other forms like വായലും vāyalum [Pr Gr Bh, p. 193], ഉന്നുന്ന് വായയുണ്ടാക vāya [VR, p. 198] വായ പൊത്തിച്ചിരിച്ചാർ vāya potticcirieeār [Veṇmaṇi's Kucēlavṛ.]

When followed by initial vowels of other words following, or when used in infelxions other than the genitives, the -*a* is not heard: നാക്കു് ṅāy-kku, പായിൽ pāy-il, കായ് എടുക്ക kāy edukka etc. നായടെ ṅāyaḍe is quite common, besid'e ṅāyind'e in one or two colloquial contexts viz., ṅāyind'e mōn which is a term of abuse , and ṅāyind'e vāl, still preserving the old augment.

2. THE ACCUSATIVE OR THE SECOND CASE.

1. The Mal. ending -e, corresponding to Tam. -ai, was evolved fairly early. The inscriptions of the 12th and 13th centuries show the second case ending -e beside -ai (as in Tamil) [GL, p. 9]

The process of evolution was: e ⋖ ə ⋖ front a ⋖ a west coast variant of Tamil ai.

The intermediate stage ə is attested by symbolic representation in Mss, like കണ്ണനെപ്പുകണ്ണു് kaṇṇane-p-pugaṇṇu (having praised Kṛṣṇa) [KG] and in വസ്തുവെക്കൊണ്ടു് vastuvə-k-koṇḍu [TAS, V, p. 59], കോനയുംകണ്ടു് konəyum-k-kaṇḍu [KR, Ār., 9]

2. Syntactic usages like രാജ്യത്തിനെ അദ്ധ്യവസിച്ചു rājyattine adhyavasiccu, met with in Bh Bh [1] are imitations of Skt. 'case' constructions. The commentary on Sutra 11 of the second śilpa of Līl. expressly condemns such usages.

(1) രാമനെ അധിവസിച്ചരേങ്ങള് [2, p. 79], ഇന്ദ്രപ്രസ്ഥത്തെ അധിവസിച്ചു [2, p. 111], ദ്വാരകയെ അധിവസിക്കുന്ന കാലത്തു [p. 86].

3. The following bases govern the accusative:—vēṛ-irikk- അരചനെ വേറിരുന്നു് arasane vēṛirun̄n̄u [RC, 826], ഉണ്ണുന്നിലും വേറിരുന്നു് uṇṇun̄ilīm vēṛirun̄n̄u [US]; vēṛ-iḍ-as in പ്രകൃതിയെ വേറിട്ടു് vēṛiṭṭu [Eḷ Rām]; mun-n-iḍ as in ദേവാവിനെമുന്നിട്ടു munniṭṭu; and pin-n-iḍ as in രാത്രിയും പിന്നിട്ടു് pinniṭṭu. [cf. nēriḍ-in അവനെ നേരിട്ടു് avane nēriṭṭu, which still exists to day.]

3. THE THIRD CASE.

1. ആൽ āl, expressing chiefly the ideas of agency and instrumentality, corresponds to Middle Tam. third case ending āl [N, 297].

Old Tam. has ān, envisaged in TC, 108.

2. ഒടു cḍu or ഓടു ōḍu expresses the idea of sociality.

3. ōḍu is used for "separation" also in early Mal. texts:—

ഉററവരോടു് വേർപാടു് ut̄t̄avarōḍu vēṛpāḍu [RC, 694]

ഇടരോടു് വേറായ് iḍarōḍu vēṛāy [KR, Ār , 42].

നീരോടു വേറായ n̄īrōḍu vēṛāya [KG].

ഇന്ദ്രത്ത്വം തന്നോടു് വേറിട്ടുപോം indrattvam tannōḍu vēṛiṭṭu-pōm [CBh, p. 290].

ചേതനയോടു പിരിഞ്ഞു് cētanayōḍu piriññu [KG].

ശരീരത്തെപ്രാണനോടു് വേർപെട്ടതുകണ്ടു് śarīratte prāṇanōḍu vēṛpeṭṭadu kaṇḍu [Pr Gr Bh, p. 259].

Eḷ. uses ōḍu in connection with "separation", though the fifth case is also associated by him with this idea :—

കിൽബിഷത്തോടു് വേർപെട്ടു് kilbiṣattōḍu vēṛpeṭṭu [Rām—, p. 23].

The fifth case ending also appears in Eḷ, as in കമ്മബന്ധത്തിങ്കൽനിന്നു വേർപെട്ടു് Karmabandhattiṅgal n̄in̄n̄u vēṛpeṭṭu [Eḷ Rām., p. 26].

The use of ōḍu for "separation" is peculiar. This usage exists in Sanskrit also [cf. Whitney's Gr., p. 95]. TC does not envisage any such mayakkam for Tam.; but oppaloppurai referred to in Sūtra 74 as one of the uses of the third case may conceivably contemplate contexts indicating 'absence of union'.

4. THE FOURTH CASE.

-ക് ku or ക്കു-kku appears as the fourth case ending for all Mal. nominal bases other than those with final n or those embodying the augment -in- [see below under "Augments"]. This dative ending is a pan-Dravidian one.

നു nu, ന്നു- nnu appearing as the fourth case ending of Mal. bases with final -n, and ഇനു inu or ഇന്നു innu associated with bases embodying the augment -in- are directly derived from older forms having final -ku or -kku.

Early Middle Tam. shows forms like വേങ്കടത്താനുക്കു vēṅga-ḍattān-u-kku [Tiruvāymoḻi, p. 46], നായിനുക്കു ṅāy-in-u-kku [HTS, p. 92], ആവിനുക്കു āvinukku, കോവിനുക്കു kō-v-in-u-kku, നാവിനുക്കു ṅāvinukku [HTS, p. 58], ഒന്റിനുക്കു ond'-in-u-kku [SII, III p. 99 ff.], in which the - u appearing before -kk is a Middle Tam "cāriyai". The Mal -nu or -nnu was derived from this type with the elision of final -kk. In RC and in the earliest west coast inscriptions, forms with -n-u-kk or -in-u-kk- alternate with those showing the developments -nu and -inu : virādanukkum [RC, 70], vēndanukku [ib., 76], tanayanukku [ib., 77]. The optional lengthening of the consonant sound -n-in Mal. [cf. Līl., IV, 2, comm.] was perhaps a compensatory one for the elision of -kk.

The demarcation in Malayāḷam of the datives with -kku from those with-inu or-nu depends upon whether the bases incorporate the augment -in -in inflexional positions, when these bases are other han those with final "person"-denoting n(for which the datives have invariably -nu) and with final "person"-denoting ḷ and r, for which -kku is invariable in the datives. The rules regarding the embodiment of the augment -in- for nominal bases appear to have become more or less consistent and uniform from about the period of the earliest literary texts. The inscriptions of the 10th century [cf. TAS, V, p. 7 and p. 32] show datives with -nu with such a fair degree of frequency that one can safely say that -nu must have already been current in the west coast colloquials about this time.

Generally uniform as the demarcation was [see below, for the rules], a few divergences exist between Old and New Mal. in respect of bases with final -l, -ḷ and -r (other than the "person" denoting ḷ and r). Dissyllabic bases with these sounds as finals

took on -kk for their datives (i. e. without the augment -in-), as in അടല്ക്കു adal-kku [RC, 428], വാദില്ക്കു vādil-kku [CAR, II, p. 16], വെയ്യില്ക്കു veyyil-kku [KR, Ār., 39]. Down till the Middle New Mal. period, forms like വിരല്ക്കു viral-kku [OT, p. 438], കോവില്ക്കു kōvil-kku [OT, p. 551] appear to have been current. In the modern colloquials, however, viral-innu, veyyil-innu, etc. appear to be more frequent except in old forms with special meanings like അന്നു മുതല്ക്കു an̠n̠u mudal-kku [contrast മുതലിന്നു mudalinnu 'for the capital' or 'for the wealth'].

The datives of monosyllabic bases with long vowels and with the above finals -l, -ḷ and r showed both -innu and -kku in Old Mal: വേലിന്നു vēlinnu [KG], മാലിന്നു mālinnu [ib.], പാരിനു pārinu [ib.], പോര്ക്കു pōrkku beside പോരിനു pōrinu [El Bh], കാല്ക്കു kālkku [Bhāg.], കോളിനു kōḷinu [KR, Ār., 98]. Apparently even in Old Mal. the augment -in- had begun to be frequently associated with these bases. In New Mal., and particularly in the modern colloquial, the ending -inu or innu has become quite common (except perhaps in some regional dialects), though old expressions like എത്രപേര്ക്കു ṗēṛ-kku 'to how many persons' [contrast പേരിന്നു pēr-innu 'for the name'] and മേല്ക്കുമേൽ mēlkku still continue to have -kk.

5. THE FIFTH CASE.

1. The Mal. termination il-n̠in̠n̠u compounded of il and n̠in̠n̠u [the past conj. participle of n̠il 'to stand'] corresponds to the Early Middle Tam. fifth case ending il-n̠inṛu-[V, Vēṫṫ,7]. Old Tamil had only -in to express the fifth case meanings [TC, 77]; il-n̠inṛu appears only in Early Middle Tamil texts.

2. Mal. iln̠in̠n̠u appears contracted as—in̠n̠u,—īn̠n̠u and even as n̠n̠u: വയറ്റീന്നു vayaṫṫīn̠n̠u [Kalyāṇ., gadya 5]; മേലീന്നു melīn̠n̠u [Bh Bh, 1, p. 27], മനയ്ക്കന്നു manaikkan̠n̠u [KU], വീട്ടീയ്ന്നു vīṭṭiyn̠n̠u [TAS, V, p. 59, l. 3], അവിടുന്നു aviḍun̠n̠u.

3. The association of the fifth case forms with ideas denoting 'fear', as in the following, does not appear to be strictly warranted by Dravidian syntactic rules; [1] such constructions are expressly prohibited by the commentary on L, II, II

---

[1]cf. the condemnation by the same commentary of usages like ദ്രോഹത്തെ ഭയപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നു [For അടുക്കുന്നില്ല on p. 7,1-32, read അറിയുന്നില്ല.]

as foreign to Dravidian:—

ജ്വരത്തിങ്കൽനിന്നുള്ള ഭയം jwarattingalńińńuḷḷa bhayam [Bh Bh, 2, p. 94];

മധ്യമന്മാർക്ക മരണത്തിങ്കൽനിന്നു ഭയം ഉത്തമന്മാർക്ക അപമാനത്തിൽനിന്ന് maraṇattingalńińńu bhayam [Eḷ Bh, p. 262];

ദുർമ്മതിപ്രഭുക്കളിൽ നിന്നുള്ള ഭയംകൊണ്ടു durmmadi prabhukkaḷil ńińńuḷḷa bhayam koṇḍu [Viṣṇ., p. 74];

തൃക്കയ്യിലുള്ളൊരു ചക്രത്തിൽനിന്നു ഭയപ്പെട്ടു cakrattilńińńu bhaya-p-peṭṭu [Naḷ. Kiḷip., p. 127 of Inter Sel.]

The Old Tam. grammar TC, 72, does provide for the use of the fifth case with añjal 'fearing', apart from the normal use of the second case; but the question whether this association of the fifth case with 'fear' may not have been due to the influence of Skt. requires to be investigated.

6. THE SIXTH CASE.

1. uḍe is the Mal. sixth case ending for all bases whose datives have—kk, while—ṅ'e [<-n-(u)ḍe or < -in-(u)ḍe] is regular for those bases whose datives have -nu,- innu,- or inu.

uḍe corresponds to the Early Middle Tamil ending uḍai mentioned in V, Vĕṫṫ., 7. For the change of—ai to—e, cf. Malayāḷam vare <varai; iḍe < iḍai; paṇḍe> paṇḍai, etc. Old Tamil uḍai or uḍai-y-a had no sixth case meaning, but it was employed [cf. TC, 220] merely as a kuṛippu vinai, as in ńin-n-uḍaittu 'is in possession of you' [Puṛanānūṛu, verse 58]; cf. Malayāḷam പലഗുണമുട ഭഗവാൻ guṇam-uḍa [K R, Bāl., 12] where uḍa may be regarded (according to Tamil rules) as a kūṛippuvinai peyareccam.

It is in Early Middle Tamil that uḍai and uḍai-y-a appear with a sixth case force. Malayāḷam uḍe is directly related to this ending, and nd'e is the resultant of the sandhi (in Malayāḷam) of -n or-in and (u)ḍe.

The earliest inscriptions of the west coast show only uḍe, uḍa, -iḍe or ḍe. The variants -iḍe and -ḍe reveal the weakening

(1) അവർക്കടയ കാംക്ഷകൾ [K Bhag, p 114] ഇവർക്കേടയ മാഹാത്മ്യം [ib., p. 74], തങ്ങൾ തങ്ങൾക്കടെ [ib., p 68] show the sixth case ending used after the dative endings. "Vulgar" colloquials show this usage even to-day.

of u (of uḍe) in the unaccented position,—a weakening which brought about the sandhi change of -n+ḍ=nd' in those bases which either had final -n or which embodied the inflexional augment - in:—വാരിയന്റിടെ vāriyan-iḍe [TAS, V, p. 82, l. 27—12th c.] അവറിടയ avar-iḍaya [ib.,IV, p. 46 ff.—12th c.]

L, I, 1 and II, 11 [commentaries] mention the sound, and I have found four instances of this ending in US:—ciṫṫappand'e [US, II, 15]; tēnmāvind'e [ib.,II,9]; puṇyattind'e [ib. I, 16] mulattottind'e [ib., I, 119]. The earliest available west coast inscriptions of the 9th to the 12th centuries do not, so far as I can see, contain instances of this ending, with the alveolar d'; but it is possible that it had become fairly common in the popular speech from a much earlier period than the 13th century.

2. It is worthy of mention here that a sixth case relationship is brought out by the use of -in in instances like pon-māḍatt-in-ṅiḻal [US, II, 9] or ēṇatt -in-paidal [K G, Kṛṣṇ., l. 525] ; this -in -occurs in other compounds also:-vaḍakk -in -kūṟu, [US, II, 23]; ponnuṅguḍam < pon-n-in-kuḍam [Bh Bh 1, p. 19].

7. THE SEVENTH CASE.

1. il as a seventh case ending corresponds to Early Middle Tamil il mentioned in V, Vēṫṫ., 7, and in N, 302. Old Tamil had no il [cf. TC, 81 and 82] as a locative ending.

2. kal or-iṅ-kal [in which latter-in-is the augment] is derivable from the Tamil postposition kāl [TC, 82 and N, 302]. Very early west coast inscriptions show kāl : കോയിൽക്കാൽ kōyil-k-kāl [TAS, IV. p. 15—10th c.], വാദിൽക്കാൽ vādil-k-kāl [TAS, II, p. 81—10th c.]. kōyilkkāl later become kōyilkkal and koyikkal [cf. TAS, VII, p. 92], and vādil-kkāl later became vādil-k-kal or vādukkal [cf. kōvilagattum-vādukkal of KU].

3. attu with a locative force as in തെരുവത്തു" teruvattu [RC, 69], നിലാവത്തു" ṅilāvattu [Bh Bh] appears not only in bases with final-am normally incorporating-att but also in others like teruvu, ṅilā, etc. The use of attu is expressly sanctioned by TE for bases like veyil [TE, 378], maḻai [288], iruḷ [403] viṇ [306], pani 'cold season' [242], vaḻi [243]. The use of attu with a locative force was quite common in Early Middle Tamil. Malayāḷam inherited this feature and has preserved it wholly

down till to-day, while modern colloquial Tamil has ceased to have it.

4 Instances like കോഴിക്കോട്ടു ചെന്നു kōḻikkōṭṭu ceṉṉu, കരയാററുപോയി karayāṯṯu pōy show the so-called "gemination" of -ṭ- and-ṟ- to convey a seventh case meaning. This "gemination" was primarily due to an ancient sandhi change arising from the meeting of ṭ and of ṟ [see my HAPJ with the augment-(a)tt-appearing, as has already been shown, with a seventh case force in ṉilāvattu, etc.

5. Forms like തിരമേ ഓടിനാൻ tīramē [KG, Hl., l. 40], അകമേ agamē, പുറമേ puṟamē, വഴിയേ vaḻiyē evidence an ē with a seventh case force. Here ē [also written sometimes short e] is primarily connected with the "emphatic" particle ē associated with a locative force in words like മുമ്പെ mumbe, പിമ്പെ pimbē, മേലേ mēlē [cf. chap. V § 7]. There may also have been some influence exerted by Skt. locatives like dūre, maddhye.

8. THE EIGHTH CASE.

1. Except the vocative types makkāḷ (of makkaḷ) and vāyilāy (of vāyilān) in which the vowels before the final consonants are altered or lengthened, all other vocative types of Tamil have their counterparts in Malayāḷam.

2. The history of the sambodhana ending- uḷḷōvē appearing so frequently in late Old Malayāḷam texts and occasionally in Early New Malayāḷam deserves to be traced here.

The earlier forms are-uḷḷōnē and-uḷḷōyē:

മാറലയച്ചുറവും മാറുള്ളോനേ māṟuḷḷōnē [KG, Ulūkh.].

കൺമായമുള്ളോനേ kaṉmāyamuḷḷōnē [ib., Hēm.].

മെയ്യഴകുള്ളോനേ meyyaḻag-uḷḷōne [Kottār. Āṭṭ., p. 114].

According to a Tamil rule envisaged in N, 307, the vocative of uḷōn may appear as uḷōy. This principle accounts for Malayalam uḷḷōy-ē (in which ē is a vocative strengthener); uḷḷōyē appears in RC, K Bhāg., CBh:—അരക്കർകുലത്തിനു കരയായുള്ളോയേ karayāyuḷḷōyē [RC, 646]; സൌമ്യനതായുള്ളോയേ saumyanadāy-uḷḷōyē [KBhāg., p. 201]; സ്വാമിയായുള്ളോയേ swāmiyāy-uḷḷōye [CBh, p. 332]; വീരനായുള്ളോയേ vīranāy-uḷḷōyē [CBh, p. 311].

The final-y of uḷḷōy(ē) appears to have been dropped [cf. the dropping of y in second personal maricca, vaṉṉā, ceyvā in

early Old Malayāḷam texts], and the dorsal glide v requisitioned after ō, with the result that uḷḷō -v -ē came into existence: ഭാഗ്യശാലിനിയായുള്ളോവേ [BhBh], ഭർത്താവായുള്ളോവേ [Eḷ Bh], പുരുഷശ്രേഷ്ഠനായിരിപ്പോവേ [Pr. Gr. Bh, p. 213]. As these instances show, uḷḷōvē was employed originally only in connection with singulars, but later when the form became a *cliche* it was used in connection with plurals also, as in പവനതുല്യവേഗികളായുള്ളോവേ pavanatulyavēgikaḷāy-uḷḷōvē [VR, p. 83]

3. The sambodhana eḍō of Malayāḷam appears in connection with masculines and feminines, singulars and plurals, as a term of "familiarity" without any association of "inferiority" or "contempt", which eḍā (for masculines) and eḍī (for feminines) have in Tamil and in Malayāḷam. This eḍō does not occur, so far as I know, in Tamil. I have not come across this eḍō in Malayāḷam texts before the period of the campus and of Bh Bh.

ഏടോ കോകിലബാലികേ eḍō kōkilabālikē [Rām. camp. Sugr., 107]
ഏടോ അച്യുതാ eḍō acyutā [Bh Bh, 1, p. 119)
ഏടോ വിപ്രപത്നിമാരേ eḍō viprapatnimārē [ib., 1, p. 89]
ഏടോ കൈകേയി eḍō kaikēyi [Eḷ Bh]
ഏടോ ദേവകളേ eḍō dēvagaḷē [Pr Gr Bh, p. 372]
മത്സന്നിധിയിൽ അണപ്പിനെടോ aṇappin-eḍō [OT, p. 442 -addressed by Rāvaṇa to the women-guards]
വെത്തിലചുരുട്ടെടോ കഞ്ഞിക്കന്നി [VPm, p. 172]

In modern colloquial Malayalam., it is rarely used for plurals. Further, in connection with feminines its use is restricted to regional dialects to-day.

9. THE DIRECTIVES

The dative ending -k-(-kk) is associated with a 'directive force in several Dravidian speeches. Tamil vīṭṭ-iṟ-ku 'to the house', a-vv-iḍ-att-iṟ-ku 'to that spot' illustrate this use. The terms for the cardinal directions, viz. vaḍakku, kiḻakku, mēṟku, contain this directive ending semi-permanently embodied in them.

This directive ending exists in Mal., as in several other Dravidian speeches.

1. In the earliest texts, forms like the following, normally evolved from older ones with-in-u-kku occur:— ഇവിടത്തിന്നു ivi̤dattinnu [KR, Kiṣk., 59], അവിടത്തിന്നു avi̤dattinnu [ib., 296], ദിക്കിനുപോയവർ dikkinu [KR, Sund., 134]. This -innu or -inu occurs in the campus, in KG and even in Eḷ [e. g. തെക്കംദിക്കിന യംത്ര dikkinu in Rām. Camp., Aṅg; കാലപുരത്തിനു പോകാം Kālapurattinu in Eḷ Rām., p. 125]Today, this directive-innu or -inu is heard in Travancore colloquials, as in വൈക്കത്തിനു പോകണം vaikkattinu, എറണാകുളത്തിനു eraṇākuḷattinu,i.e. in those contexts where the dative ending is innu or inu.

From about the sixteenth century, however, forms like വീട്ടിലേക്കു vīṭṭilēkku, സ്ഥലത്തേക്കു sthalattēkku, ദിക്കിങ്കലേക്കു dikkiṅgalēkku, അതിലേക്കു adilēkku also begin to appear frequently. This type is not met with in the works of the Paṇikkars, in US, in Līl or even in KG, in all of which the corresponding forms show -innu or -inu if and when they occur at all. RC has ഇവിടേക്കു ivi̤dēkku [87] but in this text the type is rather rare. The type is abundantly represented in Bh Bh and also met with in some of the later campus and in Eḷ. Today, the ending -ēkk is most common as a directive ending. It is constituted of ē [arising originally from an iṯṯaśai ē as in adilē, or from tēṟṟ ram ē used in connection with 'directions' or from the lēngthening of e of forms like avi̤de < a-v-v i̤dai], and the directive-kk.

2. The "conjunctive" past participle പെട്ടു peṭṭu [of pe̤d-] is suffixed in Malayalam from the earliest times in a number of contexts to denote the "directival" idea; മേല്പെട്ടു mēlpeṭṭu; കീഴ്പെട്ടു kīḻpeṭṭu [KG]; പുറത്തോട്ടു puṟatt-ōṭṭu [RC, 134] < puṟattupeṭṭu; അങ്ങോട്ടു aṅṅōṭṭu [Eḷ Bh]; പടിഞ്ഞാട്ടു pa̤diññāṭṭu [KU] < pa̤diññāṟōṭṭu < pa̤diññāṟu-peṭṭu; കരോട്ടു karōṭṭu [modern.].

Forms like പുറത്തൂട്ടു puṟattūṭṭu [RC, 140] and അകത്തൂട്ടു agattūṭṭu · [Bh Bh 1, p. 18] are semantically the same as puṟattōṭṭu and agattōṭṭu, though structurally [perhaps owing to "contamination" with forms like agattṳ̄de and pūṅgāvil-ṳ̄de which are locatives with the postposition ṳ̄de meaning 'along' 'through'] they show -ū- .

The original seanse of പെട്ടു peṭṭu disappeared very early in these contexts, and the development -ōṭṭu having been

associated from an early time with the directive idea came to be used directly in forms like aṅṅōṭṭu, paḍiññāṟōṭṭu and karōṭṭu, and even in kīḻpōṭṭ-ē-kku [Eḻ Cint., p. 28]

3. n̄ōkki, the conjunctive past participle of n̄ōkk- 'to observe', exists in old aṅṅōkki 'in that direction,' പിന്നോക്കി pinnōkki [Bhāg Daś., p. 273], ദ്വാരക നോക്കിനടന്നു dwāraka n̄ōkki n̄aḍann̄u [KG, Kucēl.l. 71], അങ്ങുനോക്കി aṅṅu n̄ōkki [ib., Saubh., l. 728], നാട്ടുനോക്കി പോകുന്നേൻ [ib., Sant., l. 34]

4. ആയ്ക്കൊണ്ടു āykkoṇḍu [associated with the dative; see § 11] is used with a directive force in the earlier texts:—

തേരിലങ്ങായ്ക്കൊണ്ടു പാഞ്ഞു" tērilaṅṅāykkoṇḍu pāññu [KG, Rugm., l. 985.]

ദണ്ഡകാരത്തിന്നായ്ക്കൊണ്ടു ഗമിച്ചിട്ടു daṇḍakārattinn-āykkoṇḍu [Eḻ Rām., p. 72], വനത്തിന്നായ്ക്കൊണ്ടെഴുന്നള്ളിൽ vanattinn-āykkoṇḍ [Rām., p. 45].

5. ആമ്മാറു āmmāṟu demotes a "directive" meaning in RC, KG and Eḻ:—വടിൽക്കലാമ്മാറു പോയ" vadilkkalāmmāṟu [RC, 134], രാജ്യത്തിലാമ്മാറു ചെന്നു rājayttilāmmāṟu [KG, Vṛkāś.], മുററത്തിലാമ്മാറു muṯṯattilāmmāṟu [ib., Kṛṣṇōlp., l. 713].

അന്തഃപുരത്തിലാമ്മാറെഴുന്നള്ളി antahpurattil-āmmāṟu [Eḻ. Rām. p. 128], അയോദ്ധ്യക്കാമ്മാറു തിരിച്ചുപോയി ayodhyakk-āmmāṟu ib., p. 23].

10. THE UNIQUE MAL. PHRASAL UNIT OF THE TYPE OF കാട്ടിലെ ആന AND THE QUALIFICATORY ē OF MAL.

From about the fifteenth century onwards, the texts show more or less frequently a unique Mal. phrasal unit in which the first constituent with a locative ending, followed by the particle ē., stands in direct relationship to the viśeṣya that forms the second constituent of the phrasal unit. In this unique Mal. construction the particle ē is annexed to the locative in order to convey the idea of a verb like ഉള്ള uḷḷa which is not expressed; and the locative form (along with ē) and the noun (or pronoun) following it together form a compound unit which may be "declined".

The type referred to above is constituted of a locative inflexional form with il-ē, -iṅ-gal-ē or -att-ē, immediately followed by the viśeṣya. att-ē appears to have been so constantly and

frequently associated with this qualificatory meaning that it was isolated as a sort of suffix and used even after verbs at in വർണ്ണാലത്തേക്കഥ vaṟṟālattē-k-katha. [See (iii) below].

It is interesting to note that this ē appearing after locatives and directives has also been used with a genitive force in some contexts [See v below.]

(i) അവനിലേ സ്നേഹം avanilē snēham [Līl., II, 11, comm.]
വായിലേ നന്മണി vāyilē nanmaṇi [KG, Rugm, l. 1071].
വീട്ടിലെ പൈതങ്ങൾ vīṭṭilē paidaṅṅaḷ [ib.]
ജലത്തിലേക്കാററു jalattilē-k-kāṟṟu [Bh Bh, 1, p. 65].

[Note the doubling of the plosive-k-, which attests the intimacy of the association of the constituents; this gemination is not always represented in writing].

കൃഷ്ണന്റെ വായിലെ ചർവ്വിതതാംബൂലം kṛṣṇand'e vāyilē carvida tāmbūlam [Bhāg, Daś, p. 256].
വയലിലേക്കണ്ടം vayalilē-k-kaṇḍam [TAS, IV, p. 163].
പള്ളിലേ വികാരി paḷḷilē vigāri [TAS, III, p. 81].
വരുണാലയത്തിങ്കലേ ഐശ്വര്യം varuṇālayattiṅgalē aiśvaryam [Bh Bh, 1, p. 104].

(ii) ദൂരത്തേ വീട്ടിലേ dūrattē vīṭṭilē [KG, Ulūkh., l. 800]
അപ്പാട്ടേപ്പൈതങ്ങൾ appāttē-p-paidaṅṅaḷ [ib]
ഇടത്തേക്കയ്യിൽ iḍattē-k-kayyil [Bh Bh, 1, p. 54]
വലത്തേ നേത്രം valattē nētram [Eḷ. Cint., p. 27]
അവിടത്തേ നമ്പൂരി avidattē ṅambūri [KU]

(iii) ചാരത്തേ വീട്ടിലെ cārattē viṭṭilē [KG, Ulūkh, l. 799]; ഇന്നത്തേ iṅṅattē [Naiṣ. camp. 95], പിന്നത്തേക്കാര്യ് [ib.]; ഇപ്പോഴത്തേതിലും ippōḷattēdilum [Girij., p. 51]; കൊമ്പത്തേക്കു kombattēkku [Vētāḷ]; ഇതിലത്തെപ്പാത്രം or ഇതിലേത്തെപ്പാത്രം idil-ette-p-pātram; പിന്നേത്തേക്കാര്യം pinnēttē-k-kāryam; ഒരാണ്ടേത്തേനികുതി orāṇḍēttē nigudi; വർണ്ണാലത്തേക്കഥ vaṟṟālattē-k-katha; വരുമ്പോഴത്തേ സന്നതി varumbōḷattē saṅṅadi; അങ്ങനത്തേ ആൾ aṅṅanattē āḷ.

(iv) കൈതക്കാട്ടേ കുവലയദൃശാം പാട്ടു kaidakkāṭṭē kuvalaya dṛśām pāṭṭu [US, I, 117]
കോഴിക്കോട്ടേ സ്സഭ kōḷikkōṭṭē- s -sabha [modern]

(v) The forms with ē in the following have a genitive force;—

നാട്ടാരേ വീട്ടിലേ n'āṭṭārē vīṭṭilē [K G, Vals., l. 1568]
അങ്ങേ ഭ്രാതാവു aṅṅē bhrātāvū [Bh Bh, 2, p. 55]
ഉണ്മോരേ ഭാഗ്യം uṇmōrē bhāgyam [MP, No. 171]
പിള്ളരേ മോഹം piḷḷarē mōham [Proverbs]
അവളേ പുത്രൻ avaḷē putran [OT, Dhruva; p. 208 of Inter Selections]
അങ്ങേ അച്ഛനും aṅṅē acchanum [OT, Sabhā]

Such instances are common in VPm:—അവളെ ബന്ധു [p. 26]; ഓളെ വമ്പത്തരം [p. 7], പെരുമാളെ ഭണ്ഡാരം [p. 35], നായരെപേരു [p. 125], ഓരൈചിലവു [p. 144], etc.

In (i), the particle ē appears after the locative endings il and iṅgal; in (ii), it occurs after -att- appearing in bases having final-am; in (iii), attē is transferred to forms where -att- cannot crop up as an inflexional augment at all, and in വന്നാലത്തെക്കഥ van'n'ālattē-k-katha even to a verb-form van'n'āl; (iv) shows ē after the geminated ṭṭ of certain place-names or house-names; (v) is peculiar in as much as here the relationship becomes genitive.

The ē of group (i) may originally have arisen from the Tamil இற்றசை īt't'āśai or terminative expletive ē [see N, 354 and TC, 257] associated normally in constructions like the following so constantly and intimately as to lead to the isolation of phrasal units: ശ്രീപണ്ടാരത്തിലേ നെൽ അളന്നു śrī paṇḍārattilē n'el aḷan'n'u [TAS, IV, p. 19]; ശകുന്തളയെന്നു എന്നെ മന്നിലേ മാലോകർ ചൊല്ലിപ്പോരു śakuntaḷayen'n'u enne mannilē mālōgar colli-p-pōrū [CBh, p. 291]; മാരുതപുത്രൻെറ വീരത ഇങ്ങിനെ പാരിലേ മാലോകർ വാഴ്ത്തുന്നേരം māruda putrand'ē vīrata iṅṅane pārilē mālōgar vāḻttun'n'ēram [CBh, p. 321].

Here, the locatives śrīpaṇḍārattil-ē, mannilē, pāril-ē containing the terminative expletive ē, normally govern the respective verbs following; but the association with the nouns immediately following, may lead to the isolation of compounds like śrī paṇḍārattilē n'el, mannilē mālōgar, pārilē mālōgar, which phrasal units could be independently employed with the meanings 'the paddy in the government treasury' 'the people in the world'.

This ē may have been then transferred to -att- appearing with a locative force in (ii) above.

In (iii),-att-ē- appears as an āgama by analogy, in instances in which the augment -att- is not normal.

The ē of (iv) after the geminated final locative -ṭṭ [<ḍ+ṭṭ, see my HAP] may be compared to (ii) above.

[Note:—the e or ē in the following categories is not related to the ē under reference in this section.

(a) പിറ്റെന്നാൾ piṯṯe-ṉ-ṉāḷ or piṯṯēṉṉāḷ [with lengthening on account of accent.]

പണ്ടേക്കാലം paṇḍē-k-kālam

മറ്റേക്കാര്യം maṯṯēkkāryam

piṯṯe, paṇḍe and maṯṯe here correspond to Tamil piṯṯai, paṇḍai and maṯṯai. For Malayalam e and Tamil ai, cf. Malayalam vare [Tamil varai], uḍe [Tamil uḍai], iḍe [Tamil iḍai] and the Malayalam acc. ending e [Tamil ai].

(b) വടക്കെമുറി vaḍakke muṟi [TAS, III, p. 81]

കിഴക്കേനമ്പിടി kiḻakkē ṉambiḍi [KU]

കീഴേച്ചുണ്ടു് kīḻē-c-cuṇḍu [Bh Bh]

ഇങ്ങേപ്പുറത്തു് iṅṅēppuṟattu

Here, the ē is originally long, being the teṯṯram ē used in connection with "direction-denoters" [cf. മുമ്പെ mumbe, പിമ്പെ pimbē].

(c) The e of ഏറെക്കാലം ēṟe-k-kālam or ēṟēkkālam, വളരെ ദ്രവ്യം vaḷare dravyam (originaily short but sometimes lengthened owing to accent) is the old infinitive participial e [< ə < a]; ēṟa, vaḷara were old infinitive participles which were later used in Malayāḷam with an "adjectival" force [See Ch. IV].

II. POSTPOSITIONS.

Postpositions which by frequent use have almost developed into regular "case"-endings have already been dealt with by me above. Here, I shall refer to few "loose" postpositions of Malayāḷam and their particularities.

1. കുറിച്ചു് kuṟiccu ["conj" participle of kuṟikk-], തൊട്ടു് toṭṭu ["conj." part-of toḍ] and കൊണ്ടു് koṇḍu ["conj." part. of koḷ] are used in the old texts in second case contexts. The use

of toṭṭu and koṇḍu with the meaning 'concerning' is non-existent in modern Malayāḷam., kuṛiccu or paṟṟi being common wherever a postposition is felt as necessary.

Some examples of toṭṭu and koṇḍu used in the earlier texts with a second case force are the following:—ഇതുതൊട്ടു വിവേകം idu toṭṭu [RC, 62]; വെണ്ണയും പാലും തൊട്ടുള്ള കൊതി toṭṭuḷḷa kodi [KG, Ulū, l. 219]; വഞ്ചനംതൊട്ടുള്ളൊരു ചൊല്ല് [ib., l. 490]; ഞങ്ങളെത്തൊട്ട് [Rām. camp., Bālivadh. gadya]; കൃഷ്ണനെക്കൊണ്ട് പറഞ്ഞു kṛṣṇane-k-koṇḍu [KG. Tīrth., l. 28]; എന്നതുകൊണ്ടുള്ള വാർത്തകൾ koṇḍuḷḷa [ib., Saubh., l. 679]; രാമനെക്കൊണ്ടു പറഞ്ഞതു നിന്നുടെ അല്പബുദ്ധി rāmane-k-koṇḍu paṟaññadu [VR, p. 214].

toṭṭu and koṇḍu, today, are postpositions signifying respectively 'beginning from' and the third case idea.

Skt. prati is used as a "second case" postposition in instances like അവളെപ്രതി മുഴത്തിതന്നരാഗം avaḷe prati [K Bh, p. 139], ചതികൾ അവനെപ്രതി പറഞ്ഞു avane prati [ib., p. 140], നമ്മെപ്രതി namme prati [ib., p. 64]; കോപവുംമാം പ്രതി വളർക്കും mām prati [Eḷ. Bh, p. 32]; ലോകരും നമ്മെപ്രതി എത്രയും സന്തോഷിക്കും namme prati [Kirāt. kiḷip., 1, l. 102].

2. koṇḍu as a postposition expresses chiefly the ideas of 'agency' or 'instrumentality' in Malayāḷam. In Middle Tamil it is very frequent, but rare in Old Tamil though kaṇai koṇḍu in Puṟanānuṟu, verse 55, may be considered to be an instance in which the original participial meaning has just begun to suffer semantic discoloration.

Skt. nimittam, mūlam, hetu are also employed in Malayāḷam to express 'agency' or 'instrumentality'.

uḍan expressing 'sociality' occurs in some of the early texts [RC]; but it has gone out of use in modern Malayāḷam in which kūḍe preceded either by the simple base or by its genitive form,is common.

Participles [1] like ഒരുമിച്ച് orumiccu, ഒന്നിച്ച് oṉṉiccu are also used to denote 'sociality'.

---

1 ഒക്കെ okke in the sense of കൂടെ occurs in Bh Bh.—യശോദയും രോഹിണിയും ഒരു ചാട്ടിമേൽ കരേറി രാമകൃഷ്ണന്മാരോടൊക്കെ [1, p. 41].

āy is used with the meaning of kūḍe in instances like the following :—

ഇരുവരുമായ് iruvarumāy [K Bhāg., p. 177]; സാഗ്രജനും സഖികളുമായേ sāgrajanum sakhikaḷum āyē [K Bhāg. p. 77]; തമ്പിയുമായേ tampiyumāye [K R, Ār., 19] This use of āy exists in Middle and Modern Tamil.

3. വേണ്ടി vēṇḍi, ആയ് āy, ആയ്ക്കൊണ്ടു āykkoṇḍu [L, II, 11, comm.] are postpositions reinforcing the fourth case signification.

It may be noted in connection with āyi ar āy that in literary Tamil the infinitive participle āga is considered more appropriate in contexts corresponding to the above : ivanukk - āga - k - koḍuttān 'he gave to this man'; but the use of āyi or āy, the conjunctive particple, instead of the infinitive particple is due to an extended application of the principle envisaged by N, 346 in certain contexts [cf. Chap IV, 7], though āy is not regarded in Tamil as a postposition proper.

4. പോക്കൽ pōkkal as a variant of പക്കൽ pakkal [cf. Middle Tam. pakkal mentioned by V and occurring in Early Middle Tam. as, for instance, in SII, III, p. 95] and പോക്കൽനിന്നു pōkkal ṅiṅṅu occur in the campus, in BhBh, Eḷ, Cāṇakky and in VR.

ദീനമാർ പോക്കൽ ആക്കിട്ടു dīnamār pōkkal [Rām. camp., Aṅg., 14]; ആർ പോക്കൽ ār pōkkal [ib., Aṅg]; കംസൻപോക്കൽ നിന്നുള്ള ഭയം Kamsan pōkkal ṅiṅṅuḷḷa bhayam [Bh Bh] ;രാഘവൻ പോക്കൽനിന്നു rāghavan pōkkal ṅiṅṅu [Eḷ Rām.] ; തമ്പോക്കൽ tambōkkal [Eḷ Harinām.]; മദയും പുത്രവും സിദ്ധാർത്ഥൻ പോക്കൽ നല്കിടിനാൻ siddhārthan pōkkal [Cāṇakky.]; ജ്ഞാതികൾ പോക്കൽ പോലുള്ള ഭയം jñātigaḷ pōkkal pōluḷḷa bhayam [VR, p. 334].

pōkkal does not, however, exist in the earliest texts or in the present-day colloquial where only pakkal and pakkal ṅiṅṅu are used.

pōkkal looks like a new formation used from the 15th to the 17th centuries, as a variant of pakkal which in structure (except for the ō) resembles it.

5. Some of the unique Mal. postpositions with a seventh case force are the following:—

(i) iḍa or iḍe [cf. Tam. iḍai as a postposition] as in kāṇ-iḍa [KR, Ār., 91], മാറിടെ māṛiḍe [KG, Rugm.], മന്നിടെ manniḍe [Bhāg. Daś., p. 158], കാട്ടിടെ ഓടി [OT, p. 645] has gone out of fashion in the modern period as a postposition proper.

(ii) ഊടെ ūḍe [from ūḍu 'centre' 'middle'] has been a very active postposition in Mal. from the earliest period:— പൂങ്കാവിലൂടെ pūṅgāvilūḍe [US]. cf. Early Middle Tam. ūḍe [Tiruvāy. p. 64]

(iii) അണയത്തു aṇayattu as as in aṇayattu ceṉṟu [KR, Ār., 82] also does not exist today, though literary texts show it in many contexts.

(iv) ചാരത്തു cārattu which appears so frequently in KG and CBh and occasionally in Eḷ and other Mal. texts is not actively current in the modern colloquial, so far as I can see.

(v) ēl, as in കഴുത്തേൽ kaḻuttēl [KR, Ār., 196], പുഷ്പകവിമാനത്തേൽ puṣpakavimānattēl 'on the puṣpakavimāna' [Rām Camp. Udyāna', 34], puraiyeḍattēl [beside puraiyeḍattinmēl] in an early insciption [TAS, II, p. 197], ഇടത്ത കാലേൽ kālēl [JKA, I, p. 279], കൊമ്പേൽ kombēl [OT, p. 233] appears to be a contraction of mēl [or-in-mēl] 'on the top of' It is significant that this postpositional affix which is very old and which is expressly pointed out in the commentary on the 11th sutra of the second śilpa in the 14th century grammar L, is current today in certain areas in Travancore.

The ēl appearing in the instances in VPm like പിടിയേൽ [p. 75=പിടികയിൽ], കൊട്ടമലേൽ [=കാട്ടമലയിൽ], കട്ടിപ്പട്ടരേൽ [p. 63കെട്ടിപ്പട്ടരുടെ കയ്യിൽ) is of course different.

6. It deserves to be noted here that most of the native postpositions of Mal. correspond to Early Middle Tam. forms used either loosely or rigidly with postpositional significations. paṟṟi kuṟittu, koṇḍu, vēṇḍi, pakkal, iḍai, cār, are all Early Middle Tam. forms. Among these, pakkal, iḍai, cār and others denoting the locative idea, are recognized by the old indigenous grammars [cf. V, Vēṟṟ., 7, comm.,] as "postpositional", while the others [conjunctive participles originally] are used in texts

with more or less a "loose" postpositional force· Okka [originally the infinitive participle of okk 'to agree with' 'to suit, fit'] has in Tam. the meanings 'in company with' [cf. okkappāḍ 'to sing in unison'] 'plentifully' and 'equally'; toṭṭu [orignally the conjunctive participle of toḍ—'to touch'] has in Tam. texts the significations 'from' [cf. Mal·], while in regional colloquials it means 'regarding' or 'concerning' [cf. Old Mal.]

12. COMPARISONAL ENDINGS

Old Tam. employed -in of the fifth case with its ellai-p-poruḷ or n̄īkka-p-poruḷ to convey the comparisonal meaning.

Middle Tamil had il and ilum and also kāṭṭil (um), pārkkil·(um)· In colloquial Tam., viḍa, pārkka, preceded by the second case, is common.

Mal. has the following.—

1. The ending -il which Gundert equates to the locative ·il but which it would perhaps be more reasonable to regard as the Early Middle Tam. descendant of old Tam. fifth case-in with the signification of n̄īkkam. [cf. എല്ലാറ്റിനും നല്ലതു ellāṯṯinum n̄alladu in BhBh]; പണ്ടേതിൽ പത്തിരട്ടിച്ചു paṇḍēdil patt-iraṭṭiccu [Rām. camp. Aṅg]; മുന്നേതിലും അധികം munnēdilum adhīkam [KR, Bāl., 283]; മുന്നേതിൽ ഏറ്റം munnēdil ēṯṯam [KG, Sālv., l. 8c]. ധരണിയിൽ വാഴ്കയിൽ നല്ലു മരണം dharaṇi-y-il vāḻga-y-il n̄allū maraṇam [Eḷ Bh]; ഇതിൽ അധികം idil adhikam [OT]; അതിൽ വലുതു adil valudu [KU].

2. kāḷ [< perhaps kāṇil; cf. kāṇe below]: പണ്ടേക്കാൾ paṇḍē-k-kāḷ, പണ്ടേതിൽക്കാൾ paṇḍēdil-k-kāḷ [US, 2, 68], പണ്ടേതിനേക്കാൾ paṇḍēdinē-k-kāḷ [US, 1,134]—ഇതിൽക്കാൾ idil-k-kāḷ [BhG] and [Naiṣ. camp.]; ഇതേക്കാൾ idē-k-kāḷ [ib.], എന്നേക്കാൾ ennē-k-kāḷ [KG, Rugm., 539].

3. kāḷil [a variant of kāṇil]
രിപുവിനെക്കാളിൽ ripuvine-k-kāḷil [Cāṇaky].

4. kāṭṭil, quite common from the earliest times, is mentioned in L, II, 11.

5. kāyil—ചന്ദുനെക്കായിൽ candune-k-kāyil [VP]
എന്നെക്കായിലും ennne-k-kāyilum [CAR, V, p. 12]
എന്നെക്കായിലും പ്രിയനായ enne-k-kāyilum [VR, p. 301]
എന്നെക്കായിൽ enne-k-kāyil [Pāṭṭ.]

6. kāṉe—ബാപ്പ നടത്തിയതിനെക്കാണ bāppa nadattiyadine-k-kāṉe [cited by Gundert from ṭippuppāṭṭu]

13. AUGMENTS.

The incorporation of certain particles as augments between bases and inflexional terminations and between the constituents of word-compounds is a characteristic feature of most Dr. languages [see my DS for a comparative discussion].

The augments met with in Mal. are the following:— -in-; -am-; a mere nasal; -aṯṯ-, -iṯṯ-; and -att-. Among these, -in- and att- are used both in inflexions and in samāsas; the mere nasal and-am appear only in samāsas; and -aṯṯ-, -iṯṯ- crop up before inflexional endings of the "neuter" plurals ava, iva, cila, pala and ellā.

The Augment-in

The chief rules relating to this augment in inflexional positions are the following:—

(i) It appears compulsorily in the datives and the genitives of bases with final u [= Tamil muṯṯriyalugaram u], and final ə, ū and ā; in the accusatives and the instrumentals of these bases, the augment is optional.

(ii) It fails to appear in the datives and genitives of bases with final -i, ī and a [<ai or palatal a]; in the accusatives and in the instrumentals, the augment may optionally appear in old Mal. [cf. Kaṇṇaśśan's sīta-y-in-āl, māya-y-in-e, etc.]

(iii) Bases with final "person"-denoting n, ḷ and r do not take on the augment; those with final -y do not have the augment except optionally in the second and the third "cases" and dialectally in datives and genitives; monosyllabic bases with short vowels and final l, ḷ, n, ṇ, r invariably embody the augment in the datives and the genitives; monosyllabic bases with long vowels and final l, ḷ, r (other than the "person'-denoting ḷ, r mentioned above) embodied the augment only optionally for datives and genitives in old Mal., but in new Mal. the augment is most common for these "cases"; dissyllabic bases with final consonants (other than the "person"-denoters) had no augment for the datives and the genitives in old Mal. and early new Mal., but today the colloquials generally embody the augment.

(iv) Plurals do not generally take on the augment though exceptional instances like പദ്യങ്ങളിനാൽ padyaṅṅaḷ-in-āl [BhG, 1, 6] exist.

(v) The augment generally does not appear before the seventh case il; but early old Mal. has a few instances like the following, evidencing a usage corresponding to that which cropped up in early Middle Tam.— പൊഴുതിനിൽ poḻud-in-il [RC, 90]; നെറിയിനിൽ neṛi-y-in-il [TAS, IV, p.125]; വെളികല്ലിനിൽ veli kallinil [TAS, IV, p. 17]; ഞാനിനിൽ [TAS, II, p. 186 —10th. c.] cf. early Middle Tam. i-m-mann-ulag-in-il [Tiruvāymoḻi].

The use of the augment -in-before the fifth case-in-is expressly disapproved by TE, 132; but when in early Middle Tam. the locative il "cropped up," the augment was sometimes embodied before this il.

(vi) The augment -in -is constant and compulsory in the inflexional endings of adu and idu and of the numerals. Old Tam. had -an -as the augment here [cf. T E, 177, 195], while Middle Tam. had -in- :—ond'-in [TAS, II, p. 49].

(vii) The use of the augment -in- for Mal. inflexional endings is of the utmost significance in connection with the formation of datives and genitives. I shall show below how the preference and the exclusion of the augment in Mal. inflexional positions was intimately connected with early Middle Tam. practice.

Old Tam.	Early Middle Tam.	Mal.
Bases with final ā, u, ū [T E, 174]—augment -in-. most common.	As in old Tam., except for the optional dropping of the augment in the Acc. and Instr.	Augment constant and compulsory in the Dat. and the Gen.; optional in the Acc. and the Instr.
Bases with final - ē- — augment most common [T E, 174].	Optional only	Bases rare; but old Mal. pē takes augment optionally.

Bases with final -ɯ. —Augment compulsory [T E, 196]	Optional for Acc. and Instr., but common in the Dat. and the Gen.	Compulsory for the Gen. and the Dat.
Bases with final -i and -ai [Mal. a]—optional [TE, 203].	Augment generally avoided	Augment never used.
Bases with final -am. — augment - in - after -att-optional.	-in-after the ādeśa -att- common in the Dat. and the Gen.	Compulsory for the Dat. and the Gen.
Monosyllabic bases with short radical vowels and final consonants—optional augment—[T E, 203].	Augment generally used.	Augment always used for the Dat. [1] and the Gen·
Monosyllabic bases with long radical vowels and final consonants—optional augment [TE, 203]	Option	Optional for the Acc. and the Instr.—for the Dat.[2] optional in Old Mal. [cf. pōrinu and pōṟkku], but augment more or less general in modern Mal.; [kālinnu, but rarely also kālkku in regional colloquials]; for the genitive, the augment is common·
Dissyllabic bases with final consonants (other than-m).—Optional [TE, 203].	Optional.	Optional for the Acc. and the Instr.—Datives had generally no augment in Old Mal.; but in New Mal. the augment came to be used frequently; today the augment is commonly used in the Dat. and the Gen.

1 Both കൈക്കു് and കയ്യിനു are heard today, the difference being "dialectal"; but the genitive കയ്യിന്റെ appears to be far more common than കയ്യുടെ.

2 The datives നായ്ക്കു്, പായ്ക്കു് nd the genitives നായുടെ, പായുടെ are common in modern speech. The genitive നായിന്റെ [cf. MP, No. 526) is heard in proverbs today.

Person-denoters like avaḷ, avar, etc. and plurals with kaḷ.—Augment never used.	Augment never used.	Augment never used.

2. The augment -in -appears in Mal. compounds, as in Tam:—പൊന്മാടത്തിൻ നിഴൽ ponmāḍatt-in-ṉiḻal [US, II, 9], വടക്കിൻ കൂറു vāḍakk-in-kūṟu [US, II, 23,—modern vadakkuṅ-gūṟu,-in-changing to-un-in the unaccented position], കിഴക്കിൻ ചിറൈക്കു kiḻakk-in-ciṟaikku [US, II, 30], നാല്പതിൻ കഴഞ്ചു ṉālpad-in-kaḻainju [TAS, II, p. 47].

The augment-am-

Though not very frequent in Mal., this augment exists in instances like മലമ്പാമ്പു malam-bāmbu and ആലമ്പൂവു ālam-būvu. TE for Tamil prescribes it for compounds involving puḷi [245] etc.

The mere nasal

This perhaps is the "reduced" form of one of the preceding augments. L, III, 12 specifically refers to it:—പൂന്തേൻ pū-ṉ-dēn, പുളിങ്കറി puḷi-ṅ-gaṟi, പൂമ്പട്ടു pū-m-baṭṭu.

The augment-aṟṟ-(iṟṟ)

TE refers to it as -vaṟṟ—but N isolates it as-aṟṟ—[See my DS]. This augment appears in the "case"-endings of ava, iva, cila, pala and ellā. In Early Middle Tamil and in Old Mal., the augment assumes the form-iṟṟ-also in connection with ava and iva.

അവയിറ്റിങ്ങളും avayiṟṟiṅgaḷum [US, I, 17]
അവയിറ്റിനുടെ avayiṟṟinuḍe [KR, Kiṣk., 219]
ചെറിയവയിറ്റിനുക്കു ceṟiyavayiṟṟinukku [K Bhāg, p. 54]
ഇവിറ്റിനു iviṟṟinu [TAS, II, p. 173]
ഇവയിറ്റോടു ivayiṟṟōḍu [K Bhāg., p. 60]
പലറ്റിലും palaṟṟilum [Bhāg, p. 10]
എല്ലാവറ്റെ ellāvaṟṟe [Kucēl. Vañji, l. 213]

Both ivaiyaṟṟ-, avaiyaṟṟ-and ivaṟṟ-, avaṟṟ-are allowed by TE [cf.178 and 184];the former persisted in literature down till Early Middle Tam. and Early Old Mal. avaṟṟ and ivaṟṟ were more popular afterwards. Beside avaṟṟ-and ivaṟṟ-, inflexional forms (without the augment) like ava-y-uḍe, ava-y-āl,avaikku also gained currency. Today, the colloquial uses these last-mentioned inflexional forms of ava and iva normally, the old avaṟṟ-being

limited to contexts implying "contempt" [with reference to "irrationals', as well as to "humans" when regarded with contempt]. Further, new nominatives ivaťťa, avaťťa [in some colloquials today] and ivaťťiññaḷ īťťiññaḷ, avaťťaññaḷ [certain British Malabar colloquials] have been formed from the inflexional stem. Bhīṣm. has ivaťťa [pp. 64 and 67] used as nominatives with reference to "irrationals".

avaťťagaḷ-uḍe [Bh Bh, 2, p. 39] and ivaťťagaḷe-k-koṇḍu [ib., 2, p. 40] presuppose similar nominatives with-gaḷ (the plural affix).

Cilaťť-and palaťť-have ceased to be actively current in the present-day colloquial, but ellāťť-is quite an exclusive inflexional stem for ellā. The augment was, however, omitted in the old literary form ellāyilum [RC, 407; Rām. camp.; Bhāg. Daś, etc.].

The augment -att-

-att-, as a rule, is inserted in the "case"-terminations of noun-bases with final -am, as in mar-att-il, etc. In the older texts, however, instances like തിരമോടു tiṛam-ōḍu [KR, Ār., 157], നലമോടു ṅalam-ōḍu [Eḷ Bh] exist without the augment. Skt. words adapted in Mal. with an original or a new final -am, also take on the augment -att- in their "case"- terminations, but here again there are numerous instances without the augment.

-att- sometimes crops up as a result of "popular" analogy, as in അടിയത്തിന്നു aḍiyattinnu [Pūndānam's Santānagō], അടിയത്തോടു aḍiyattōḍu [beside അടിയന്നു adiyannu and അടിയനോടു aḍiyanōḍu]. Even the "popular" noun kūṭṭān derived from the inf. participle, takes on, in the "vulgar" colloquial, -att- sometimes, as in കൂട്ടത്തിന്.

-att- appears in compounds like the following:—old kapikulatt-araśan, āyiratt-āṇḍu; kuvaḷatt-ila, ēlatt-ari.

The use of -attu with a locative meaning without any affix or postposition following it, and of attē with a qualificatory value [unique Mal.!] in phrasal units has already been adverted to.

Augments in Tam. and Mal.

It would be useful to sum up here the important differences between Tam. and Mal. in the use of augments in general:—

(1) While all the augments of Mal. exist in Tam., Mal. lacks the following Tam. augments:

on [TE, 181], an [TE, 177], the so-called -ikk- and -akk- [TE, 127, 128].

(2) The rules regarding the use of -in -in inflexional positions became fixed in Mal. more or less (i. e. with due allowance made for "regional" variations) according to the usage current in the Early Middle Tam. period [see above].

(3) Mal. -iṫṫ- in pad-iṫṫ-āṇḍu, etc. is the same as the Tam. augment; but -iṫṫ-in iviṫṫ, avayiṫṫ- of Old Mal. follows the colloquial of Early Middle Tam., current in the west coast.

(4) The developments avaṫṫa, avaṫṫagaḷ, ivaṫṫa, ivaṫṫagaḷ are unique in Mal.

(5) While modern colloquial Tam. has lost the augment -in- in inflexional positions [the process perhaps started in the colloquial very early, since forms like adukku, peṇṇ-u-kku were already common in the Middle Tam. period] and also əṫṫ for avai and ivai, colloquial Mal. has permanently retained -in- regularly in the inflexions of the types shown in the list above, and aṫṫ also in avaṫṫa, avaṫṫagaḷ, etc.

14. PLURALS.

The general rules of plural formation in Mal. are more or less the same as those of Tam. A few features, however, merit mention (or discussion) here.

1. The use of the plural ending -kaḷ.- was in Old Tam. restricted to "irrationals" and even here only optionally [cf. TC, 169 and 171]; but in early Middle Tam. [cf. V, Vēṫṫ., 2] this plural ending was used for "rationals" also. Mal. agrees with Early Middle Tam. in this respect, since forms like rājākkaḷ, vasukkaḷ, asurargaḷ, avargaḷ, bhrāṫakkaḷ are all common in the earliest Mal. texts and inscriptions.

2. The plural ending mār, employed primarily with a connotation of "dignity" (but in later stages used in instances like cōranmār, etc. also) is most active in Mal. today, while in modern colloquial Tam. it is restricted to regional dialects.

Mal. instances like rajākkanmnār, gurukkanmār [Tam. gurukkaṉ-mār where ṉ is the sandhi-changed representative of ḷ of kaḷ] owe their n to analogy with the n of araśanmār, kumāran-mār, etc.

The n of നായന്മാർ nāyanmār, പട്ടന്മാർ paṭṭanmār, അമ്മയാന്മാർ ammayānmar [cf. merely honorific ammayār in US, 2, 15] is also analogically introduced here in the stead of original r [of ār or ar, the honorific ending of nāyar, paṭṭar and ammayār.]

The following with double and triple plural endings are peculiar:— പിടാക്കന്മാർകൾ piḍākkanmārgaḷ [K Bhāg, p. 246], നരപതിമാർകൾ narapatimārgaḷ [BhG, 1, 8], പരദേവതമാർകൾ paradēvatamārgaḷ [Paḍap.], അടികൾമാർ aḍigaḷmār'saints' [TAS, II, p. 85], വാഴുമവർകൾമാർ vāḷumavargaḷmār [TAS, III, p. 194, l. 12].

The following forms also merit mention here: പതിനാറുമാർ padināṟumār [TAS, III, p. 194], പരുന്തന്മാർ parundanmār [KBhr, p. 102], പാമ്പന്മാർ pāmbanmār [Bh Bh], വണ്ടന്മാർ vaṇḍanmār [Bh Bh], വണ്ടത്താന്മാർ vaṇḍattānmār [VR, p. 201], ശ്വാനന്മാർ śvānanmār [VR, p. 281], മർക്കടത്താന്മാർ maṟkkaḍattānmār [OT, p. 484].

3. പെണ്ണുങ്ങൾ peṇṇuṅṅaḷ, appearing in Mal. from a very early time has always been distinguished in meaning in Mal. from peṅṅaḷ, the normal plural of peṇ, which however early assumed [cf. അച്ഛന്റെപെങ്ങൾ acchand'e peṅṅaḷ in Bh Bh, 2, p. 53] the meaning 'sister' [modern colloquial peṅṅaḷ or peṅṅaḷa (as in VP and in colloquials today)] and had further a new plural പെങ്ങമ്മാർ peṅṅammār [VP, I, p. 10] or പെങ്ങളാർ peṅṅaḷār.

Similarly, āṇuṅṅaḷ 'males' is distinguished in meaning from āṅṅaḷa 'brother' [KG; VP] from an early time, this āṅṅaḷa having a new plural āṅṅaḷa-mār or āṅṅaḷār.

I think that the forms peṇṇuṅṅaḷ and āṇuṅṅaḷ may have been newly constituted as a result of the semantic restriction suffered by the original normal plurals āṅṅaḷ and peṅṅaḷ in Mal.

In കുഞ്ഞുങ്ങൾ kuññuṅṅaḷ, perhaps the nasal group ññ of kuññu was partly responsible for inducing the nasal before kaḷ.

Both kiḍākkaḷ [normal] and kiḍāṅṅaḷ [KG, Vals., l. 1082] exist in Mal.

പോത്തങ്ങൾ pōttaṅṅaḷ [Bh Bh, 1, p. 75] and നിർമ്മര്യാദങ്ങൾ niṟmmaryādaṅṅaḷ [cf. Rām. camp., Sugr., 27] are strange formations not current today. cf. കർത്തങ്ങൾ kaṟttaṅṅaḷ 'priests' [TAS VII, p. 152—16th c.], കർത്തനാർ kaṟttanār being honorific.

4. The epicene plural endings with -r exist in Mal. as in Tamil:— നാലർ nālar [Rām. camp.], എഴുവർ eḷuvar [Rām. camp.], മകളർ magaḷar [Eḷ. Bh. and Naiṣ. camp.] The last form appeared to have been colloquially active down till the early New Mal. period; magaḷer exists in the language of the Nambudiri Brahmins even today. പെണ്ടി peṇḍi 'woman' as sing. exists in an old proverb: അടക്കമില്ലാപ്പെണ്ടി adakkamillā-p-peṇḍi [Proverbs, No. 31]; the plural form in Old Mal. was not peṇḍir as in Old Tam. but only പെണ്ടികൾ peṇḍigaḷ. [J K A, I, p-455]

5. kār appearing in modern വണ്ടിക്കാർ vaṇḍikkār, വേലക്കാർ vēlakkār, etc. has to be traced to kār-ar [cf. Eḷ's കുറളക്കാരർ kuraḷakkārar and ചതിക്കാരർ cadikkārar and also അവസരക്കാരർ avasarakkārar in VR, p. 99 but കൂട്ടുകാർ kūṭṭugār in OT,] in which the genuine pl. suffix-ār appears. kār- is a Sanskrit suffix with which forms like vēlakkāran, etc., have been formed in some of the south Dr. speeches.

In Travancore documents and in certain regional colloquials, the plural kār-ar appears as-kāṟ-ar, while generally in other parts of Malabar today the coalesced-kār stands for kār-ar.

For kāṟar, cf. പരിചകാറർക്കു paricagāṟarkku [TAS, IV, p 86 ff—13th c], and നാട്ടുകാറർ nāṭṭugāṟar, സർവാധികാര്യക്കാറർ sarvādhikāryakkāṟar in a late 18th cent. document reproduced in JKA, I, p. 42.

The change of post-dental or alveolar r to a cerebral ṟ on account of the influence of neighbouring back vowels is a special feature of Mal. phonology [see my PMP]; cf. the following colloquial forms occurring in V Pm:—ഓറു ōṟu [= അവർ avar]; ജോനോറു jōnōṟu [= ജോനകർ jōnakar], etc.

CHAPTER II.

DEMONSTRATIVES.

1. The Old Tam. intermediate demonstratives on an- u-basis ceased to be active in the Middle Tam. period. Mal. also does not have them.

Gundert [Gr., p. 38] seeks, though with considerable hesitation [cf. Mal. Dict., p. 121], to identify the old intermediate demonstrative in Mal. forms like പറഞ്ഞൂടു paṛaññūdu, വന്നൂടു vaṉṉūdu, കൊടുപ്പൂടു keḍuppūdu; but forms like പറഞ്ഞൂടു paṛaññūdu, occurring in K G and other early texts may probably be constituted of the Mal. finite of the type paṛaññū [with final full u] and the expletive adu of which a-has been absorbed, while forms like ഓടൂടും ōḍūdum, പാടൂടും pāḍūdum may have been derived from ഓടുവതും ōḍuvadum and പാടുവതും pāḍuvadum [cf. my observation in Ch. IV in connection with the ū of the unique Mal. Indeterminate tense].

2. The adjectival use of adu, idu in Mal. [instead of i, ī, and a, ā] as in idu poḻudu [K R, Ār., 10] and idu vaḻi [K R, Bāl., 77] is somewhat peculiar. Such a usage is not current in Old Tam.; but Middle Tam. and the modern colloquial allow collocations like adu māḍiri, idu pōle, etc.

3. The use of a and i before relative verbal participles, as in ഇക്കെട്ടവിശേഷം i-k-keṭṭa viśēṣam [K R, Sund., 138] and ഇക്കണ്ട രൂപത്തിൽ i-k-kaṇḍa rūpattil [K G, Vals., l. 1506] is quite unique in Mal.

4. The absence of the gemination of the sound v [from the glide v] in aviḍe, iviḍe [current in Mal. from the earliest known times], and the lack of grammatically standardized sandhi units like Tam. a-v-yānai 'that elephant, are other Mal. speciialities recognized by L, III, 2 and 3.

5. The common modern Mal. demonstratives ā and ī [the lengthened forms of a and i] occur in Old Tamil only in poetry according to TE, 209. It is worthy of note that these lengthened demonstratives are, while restricted to poetry in Tamil, very

commonly used in the literary and the colloquial dialects alike in Mal., Telugu and Kannaḍa.

6. av and iv, the plural "neuter" demonstratives in old instances like ഇവെല്ലാം ivellām [K R, Ār., 8] may be compared to av and iv of Tam.

7. It may be mentioned here that, while the plurals av(a) and iv(a) had always the augment -att- in inflexional endings in Old Tamil, the practice of optionally dropping this augment in the inflexional forms of the plural bases appears to have cropped up in the Middle Tam. stage, since forms like avai-y-ōḍu occur in Middle Tam. This optional practice exists in Mal. also from the earliest literary period; and in the modern colloquials, Mal. generally drops the augment in the inflexional forms of these bases.

8. In Mal., from the earliest known period,-idu [1] appears in literary texts after finite tense-forms (when there are no personal endings) as a mere expletive in all persons and numbers (without showing grammatical concord with the subject):—ഓലയും എഴുതി ഇട്ടിടു iṭṭidu [TAS, V, p. 85—12th century], കാണായിടു kāṇāyidu [KR, Bāl., 80]; ചെന്നിടു ദിനങ്ങൾ cenṟidu dinaññaḷ [KR, Bāl., 82]; അവൻ വിപ്രവരർക്കു കൊടുത്തിടു ദാനം avan vipṛavaraṛkku koḍuttidu dānam [ib. 49]; എങ്കിലും മറഞ്ഞിടു അന്നിശിചരന്മാർ maṛaññidu anṉiśicaran-mār [RC, 843].

-udu also appears as an expletive particularly in connection with tense-forms with final-u:—

എങ്ങൾ വന്നൂടു ennal vanṉūdu [CBh, p. 315 of Inter. Selections]; പറഞ്ഞുടേ paṛaññudē [El Bh].

Rarely,-adu appears as a partial expletive: ഇപ്പുറം കാമിനികളുടെ മിന്നവങ്ങൾ സ്ത്രീകൾ കാട്ടിയടു strīgal kāṭṭiyadu [Bh Bh]; ഈ വാസുദേവകഥ മൂന്നു പരിഷയെ ശുദ്ധിവരുത്തുന്നടു śuddhi varuttunṟa-du [Bh Bh, 1, p. 2].

---

1. idu as a variant of-adu in "neuter" participials has been referred to in the commentary on Vīracōḻīyam as occurring in (colloquial) Tam., under sūtra 11 of the kṛiyā padalam. Perundēvanār refers to variants like ഉണ്ബിടു uṇbidu and ഉറങ്ങുവിടു uṛaṅguvidu. Of course in Tam., the "neuter" force was never lost sight of.

idu, as a variant of-adu occurs in Mal. inscriptions in forms (with a gentle "hortative" meaning) like ചെയ്വിടു, കൊടുപ്പിടു etc. [See ch. IV.]

These two last-mentioned constructions mark a transition stage, since the forms with-adu may be regarded as participials].

നമ്പിരാട്ടിയാർ അമൈച്ചിട്ടു കൊ തിരുവിളക്കിനു amaiccidu [TA S, II, p. 177—10th c.] shows a participial noun pure and simple, while കൊടുത്തിട്ടു koḍuttidu in the same inscription p. 204, shows the transition from the participial to the expletive stage.

I think that originally the forms were used as participials [1] and that afterwards (perhaps along with the disintegration of personal endings)-idu (and rarely-udu), the phonetic variants of adu, came to be used as mere expletives.

9. In this connection I may note that പല pala and ചില cila when used appositionally or predicatively generally show the plural forms in OldMal.; but gradually by about the time of Eḻ, paladu and ciladu began to be used when the plural idea was clear from the context:—

ഉടൽ പലവും uḍal palavum [KR, Utt., 261]
നാൾപലവാ nāḷ palava [ib., 176]
പലവകാണ്‍ palava [RC, 453]
ഇവ പലവിൽ iva palavil [K Bhr, p. 133]

Eḻ uses both palavum and paladu alike:—ചൊല്ലുകൊള്ളുക പലവും ശാസ്ത്രങ്ങളും palavum [Eḻ Bh]; പലവുംനിരൂപിച്ചു palavum [ib.]; പറയേണമെംപല pala [ib]; കഴ്ച്ചകളും പലതുണ്ടു paladu [ib.]; ഇതിഹാസചരിത്രങ്ങളും പലതും paladum[Cint].

VR has മാനങ്ങളും പലതുണ്ടു mānaṅṅaḷ paladuṇḍu [p. 2], വീടുകളും പലതിലും vīḍugaḷ paladilum [p. 280], ചിലതുനാൾ ciladu nāḷ [p. 165].

Today, paladu is far more common than palava in the above contexts.

---

1 Instances like വന്നുതായി vannūd-āyi [KG, Prāvṛḍ. l. 4] പോയിതായി pōyidāyi [ib., Hemant., l. 2] show the bhāvavacana or verbal noun force of the participial.

CHAPTER III.

PRONOUNS.

The forms showing distinctive features in Mal. are dealt with below.

1. The first person singular ñān with initial ñ may have been an archaism of the west coast. Old Tamil shows yān, while Middle Tamil has n'ān beside older yān.

The "oblique" or the inflexional base has en-both in Tam. and in Mal., as in certain other Dravidian speeches; but Mal. enikku, the dative, shows -i- in the stead of -a- of Tam enakku. Sometimes, however, ñān itself appears before the postpositions mūlam [ñān mūlam, Eḷ Bh.] and nimittam [KR, Sund.]

2. The first person plural forms in Mal. are the following:—old ñāṅṅaḷ [KR. Sund, 76 and RC, 34].

ñaṅṅaḷ, another "exclusive" form with shortening of the basal-ā-, met with in the older texts and in present-day speech. cf. the "oblique" n'aṅgaḷ of Early Middle Tam. [e. g. Tiruvāy-moḷi, III, 9, 3].

n'ām or n'ōm, is the old "inclusive" form. ō [=long o] in ഞോം n'ōm, and o in ഞൊമ്മയും n'ommayum and ഞൊമ്മടെ nommaḍe [CAR III, p. 20] are due to the influence of the bilabial-m. n'ammaḷ is another "inclusive" form.

3. The history of the first person plural pronouns ñāṅṅaḷ, ñaṅṅaḷ and the "oblique" eṅṅaḷ- and ñaṅṅaḷ- is noteworthy.

(a) Old Tamil completely lacks the first person plurals with the ending kaḷ. It is in the Early Middle Tam. stage that kaḷ in n'ānkaḷ [Nom.], n'aṅkaḷ ["oblique"] and eṅkaḷ ["oblique"] appears. The Mal. forms, in so far as they show the plural ending kaḷ for these, correspond to the Early Middle Tam. ones.

(b) Mal. ñāññaḷ [with a unique palatal ñ- not found in Tam. n'āṅkaḷ] is used in the earliest texts both as the Nom. and as the "oblique" stem: n'āññaḷ-e [KR, Kiṣk., 99], ñāññaḷ-il [ib., 307], [RC, 834].

(c) More frequent as the "oblique" stem in the earliest texts than ñāññal- or ñaññaḷ- is eññaḷ- [corresponding to Mid. Tam. "oblique" eñkaḷ-]. eññaḷ- is the "oblique" stem appearing exclusively in US; and eññaḷ- beside the "oblique" ñaññaḷ- appears in KG, in Bh Bh, in the campus and in Eḷ's works. Rarely it crops up in later works like Vetāḷ. While it was exclusive in US, it is gradually displaced by ñaññaḷ- as the "oblique" stem in later texts, till in the modern Mal. stage it has been more or less ousted except in certain communal colloquials. That at an early stage eññaḷ- was fairly deep-rooted in Mal. is indicated by the use of eññaḷ as a Nom. also, as in eññaḷum...cellumbōḷ [KG, Vals., l. 411], eññaḷ vaṅṅūdu [C Bh, p. 315], eññaḷ ceṅṅu [Girij., p. 3].

4. എമ്മിൽ em-m-il [RC, 269] with the "oblique" base em- [cf. Old Tam. em-] is perhaps an imitation of Tam. usage. cf. also ഒരു പരവനിതാ ച ഞാനും എമ്മിൽ പ്രണയവിരോധം oru paravanitā ca ñānum emmil praṇayavirōdham [L, 4, 11, cit.].

5. The inflexional base of the second person singular in Mal. is ṅin- and not un- as in Tamil. This ṅin- has been exclusively used in Mal. from the earliest known times, and therefore it may be definitely isolated as an archaism.

In the dative,' it appears sometimes in the colloquial as നിണക്കു ṅinakku with the cerebral ṇ which is perhaps due to the influence of the velar plosive-kk- following.

6. The second person plural ṅiññaḷ of Mal. corresponds to the Middle Tam. ṅīñ-kaḷ [Old Tam. had only ṅīr, ṅīyir].

But while the inflexional base in Middle Tam. is uñ-kaḷ [Old Tam. nim- or num-], the Mal. inflexional base is ṅiññaḷ- itself, to which the "case"- terminations are annexed.

7. നിമ്മിൽ nim-m-il of RC 32, is a Tamilism [cf. old Tam. num-].

8. The only form of the plural reflexive pronoun tām, used today is tammil; but tām itself [very frequently in RC and in the works of the Paṇikkars], and the inflexional forms tamukku, tammōḍu, tamme occur in the texts.

9. The following syntactic uses of tān and taññaḷ are old:—

(i) The merely "expletive" use as in രാമൻ താനെ ചെന്നു rāman

tannuḍe and ഭഗവാൻ തനിക്കു് bhagavān tanikku. As a "poetic" device this usage exists even today; but instances like ദന്തങ്ങൾ തന്നുടെ dantaññaḷ tannuḍe [KG, Vals., l. 171], മന്ത്രികൾ തന്നുടെ mantrigaḷ tannuḍe, where the singular tannuḍe is associated with plurals would be unusual in modern poetry.

(ii) tāne and taniye meaning "alone" have fallen into disuse.—സന്താളും താനേ വരും tāne varum [Eḷ Bh], തനിയേ പരിഭേവനം ചെയ്യുതിന്നു taniyē [Eḷ Bh].

(iii) taññaḷ 'alone', as in gōkkaḷ taññaḷe 'the cows of their own accord' [Eḷ Bh]; cf. also താങ്ങളേയ് tāññaḷēy in a tenth century inscription [TAS, V, p. 36].

(iv) taññaḷ used emphatically, as in ഞങ്ങൾക്ക രാജാവു ഞങ്ങൾ തങ്ങൾ ñaññaḷ taññaḷ 'we ourselves and none else' [KG, Kamsasalg., l. 60].

(v) The use of instances like the following is no longer current today:—

ആയന്മാർ തന്നുടെ തന്നുടെ കന്നും തെളിച്ചു് tannuḍe tannuḍe [KG, Ulūkh.—Note the use of the singular tannuḍe in connection with the pl. subject].

മന്ത്രികളെല്ലാരും തന്നുടെ തന്നുടെ [ib., Kamsam., l. 243]

തങ്ങളാൽ തങ്ങളാൽ ആയ സല്ക്കാരവും taññaḷāl taññaḷāl [Eḷ Bh]

തങ്ങൾക്ക തങ്ങൾക്കു് taññaḷkku taññaḷkku [ib.]

ജനങ്ങളൊക്കയും താന്താൻെറ tāndānd'e [VR, p. 88]

തങ്ങടെ തങ്ങടെ പരിവാരത്തോട taññaḍe taññaḍe [OT, p. 79]

10. The use of tān in contexts like അനുഗ്രഹിക്ക താൻ നിഗ്രഹിക്ക താൻ anugrahikka tān ṅigrahikka tān [Bh Bh, I, p. 70], മഴ താൻ ഇരുട്ടു താൻ maḷa tān iruṭṭu tān [Eḷ Bh, p. 373] appears to be old.

11. The present-day colloquial use of tān for 'thou' [from ṅī tān with ṅī dropped] is at least as old as the period of the early campus: ഞാനാരെന്നും താനാരെന്നും ñān-ār-eṅṅum tān ār eṅṅum [Rām. camp., Aṅg.].

On the whole, the pronominal forms of Mal. correspond to Early Middle Tam. forms except for (i) the palatal ñ of ñān, ñāññaḷ and ñaññaḷ; and (ii) the "oblique" ṅin- [sing.] and ṅiññaḷ-[pl.].

CHAPTER IV.

VERBS.

1. BASES

1. Mal. verbal bases are mostly directly allied to Early Middle Tam. verb-bases. There are, however, a number of bases in Mal., which have no direct counterparts in Tamil or which evidence structural and semantic modifications. It may be said at once that not one of these unique indigenous verb-bases of Mal. can be said to be nearer related to any non-Tamil Dravidian speeches than to Tamil (particularly Middle Tam.).

(a) Some Mal. bases that do not have *direct* counterparts Tamil (or in any other known Dravidian speech) are the following.

അടര് aḍar-'to be peeled off'		
അയക്ക് aya-kk-'to send'	cf. Tam.	aśai-kk-'to move'
കത്ത് katt-'to burn'	,,	kand-'to be scorched'
കയര്ക്ക് kayaṟ-kk-'to be angry'	,,	kayar 'astringency'
കിളര്ക്ക kiḷaṟ-kk-'to be corroded'		
കിഴുക്ക് kiḻukk-'to knock on the head'	,,	kīḻ 'below'
കിളെക്ക് kiḷai-kk' -'to dig out'	,,	
കിഴെക്ക് kiḻai-kk-'to grow old'	,,	kiḻavan, etc
കേഴ് kēḻ-'to weep'	,,	kēv-'to gasp'
കുടെ kuḍai- 'to fling out hands, etc.'		
കൊതിക്ക് kodi-kk- 'to be greedy'		
ചാട് cāḍ-'to leap'		
ചുമെക്ക് cumai-kk-'to cough'	,,	tumm 'to sneeze'
[or തുമെക്ക് of KG]		
ചെന്ന് ceṅṅ-'to grow red'	,,	cem-'red'
ചെത്ത് cett-'to cut'	,,	cedukk-
തമിഴ് tamiḻ [as in tamiṉṉ-in KG]		
തറ് taṟ-'to sink'		
തികക്ക് tiga-kk-'to be boiled, as milk'		
തികെ tigai-'to be completed, filled'		
തിരെ tirai-'to search for'		
തിരക്ക് tirakk-'to inquire'		

തുനി 'to venture'	,, tuṉi-'to resolve'
തുരക്കു് tura-kk-'to bore'	,, turuv-
തുറിക്കു് tuṟi-kk- 'to bulge out, as eyes, etc.'	
തൂറു് tūṟ-'to defecate'	,, tūṟ-'to drizzle'
തെണ്ടു് teṇḍ-'to roam about like a beggar'	,, teṇḍ=tēḍ-[in the 15th c. Naiḍadam.]
തേകു് tēg-'to bale up water'.	
തെളിക്കു് teḷi-kk-'to drive cattle'.	
തൊഴിക്കു് toḻi-kk-'to beat the breast'.	
നിരങ്ങു് ṉirañṅ-	,, n'irai 'row'.
പാർക്കു് pāṟkk-'to live, reside'	
പിഴുകു് piḻug-'to slip off'	
പുലമ്പു pulamb-'to appear'	,, pula-p-paḍ and pulam 'field'.
പുഴങ്ങു് puḻañṅ-'to be uprooted'	
പൊട്ടു് poṭṭ-'to break,' 'to sprout out'	,, poḍi-
പൊലിക്കു് poli-kk-'to -extinguish'	
പൊന്തു് pond-'to rise'	
മാന്തു് mānd-'to scratch'	
മിണ്ടു് miṇḍ-'to utter words'	,, miṉumiṉukk 'to utter words indistinctly'
മൂളു് mūḷ-'to hum'	
മേടു് mēḍ-'to hammer'	
മുഷി muṣi 'to be soiled'> 'to be estranged'	,, mūḻkku.
വിശക്കു് viśa-kk-'to feel hungry	,, viyai-'to desire'.

(b) Some Malayāḷam verb-bases showing structural peculiarities are the following:—

അനങ്ങു് anañṅ-'to be moved'-	cf. Tamil alañg
അമ്പു് aṅb 'to love' [as a verb]	,, ,, anbu [noun]
എത്തു് ett- 'to reach'	cf. Tamil eṭṭ-and att-
ഊക്കു് ū-kk-'to shed water'	,, ,, ugu-kk-
ഈടു് īḍ- ,to be joined'	,, ,, īṇḍ-
ഏകു് ēg-'to order'	,, ,, ēv-
ഏശു് ēś-'to be like'	,, ,, ēy-
ഓലു് ōl-'to flow'	,, ,, oli-kk-

കലര് kalar-'to be mingled'	,,	,,	kala-kk-
കോര് kōr-'to draw up water'	,,	,,	kōl-
ചവിട്ട് caviṭṭ-'to tread on'	,,	,,	cavaṭṭ-
ചൂണ്ട് cūṇḍ- 'to point at'	,,	,,	cuṭṭ-
തണുക്ക് taṇu-kk- 'to become cold'	,,	,,	taṇbu 'cold' ness'
തഴുക് taḻug- 'to embrace'	,,	,,	taḻuv-
നിവിര് n̈ivir- 'to rise'	,,	,,	n̈imir-
നുഴ് n̈ūḻ-'to creep through'	,,	,,	n̈uḻai-
തിങ്ങ് tiṅṅ- 'to be crowded'	,,	,,	tiraṅg-
പകര് pagar- 'to be transferred'	,,	,,	peyar-
പതുക്ക് padu-kk- 'to be soft'		,,	paduṅg-
പായ്ക്ക് pāy-kk- 'to cause to spread'	,,	,,	pācc-
പൂക് pūg- 'to enter'	,,	,,	pug-
പുതുക് pudug- 'to be renewed'	,,	,,	pudu-kk- 'to renew'
പണി paṇi- 'to work' [as a verb]	,,	,,	paṇi 'work'
ചിമ്മ് cimb-, cimm- 'to wink'	,,	,,	cimiṭṭ-
തിരി tiri- 'to understand'	,,	,,	teri-
പെരുമാറ് perumāṟ- 'to go about' 'to treat about'	,,	,,	parimāṟ-
[also old parimāṟ and parumāṟ-]			
തുടങ്ങ് tuḍaṅṅ- 'to begin'	,,	,,	toḍaṅg-
തുടര് tuḍar- 'to follow, continue'	,,	,,	toḍar-
പെണ്ണ് peṇṇ- [in KG]	,,	,,	paṇṇ-
വീയ് vīy- [past stems vīd- and vīyi]	,,	,,	vīś-
മുങ്ങ് muṅṅ- 'to be immersed'	,,	,,	muḻug-
വീട് vīḍ- 'to be returned, recouped'	,,	,,	mīḷ-

വേണ് vēṇ- 'to wish for'	,,	,,	vēṇḍ-
മേടിക്ക് mēḍi-kk- 'to receive'		causative	vēṇḍuvi
കെടുത്ത് keḍutt- 'to extinguish'	,,	,,	keḍ- 'to be destroyed'
പൊക്ക് pokk- 'to cause to rise'	,,	,,	only poṅg- 'to rise' and the noun pokkam.

(c) The following Malayāḷam bases show semantic variations or developments.

കോല് kōl- [used in a general sense, as in campu മേളം കോലും mēḷam kōlum, ഭംഗി കോലും bhaṅṅi kōlum, Eḻ's വിസ്മയം കോലും vismayam kōlum, ഭക്തി കോലും bhakti kōlum].

തൈക്ക് tai-kk- 'to beat'; in Tamil the word is not used for 'blows, given to persons in a fight'.

ഓങ്ങ് ōṅṅ-has the generalised meaning 'to attempt' in Old Malayāḷam; Tamil ōṅg-means 'to lift up' 'raise', etc.

പുലമ്പ് pulamb- 'to appear' [as in പുലമ്പിടേണം അൻപിൽ എൻ തമ്പുരാനേ pulambīḍēṇam anbil en tamburānē] owes its meaning to contamination with പുലപ്പെടു pula-p-peḍ- 'to be exposed, to appear'. Malayāḷam pulamb- with the meaning 'to prattle' corresponds of course to the Tamil word.

കേൾക്ക് kēḷ-kk- has in Malayāḷam only the meaning 'to hear'; Tamil shows 'to hear' and 'to ask'.

ഞണ്ണ് ńaṇṇ-in Malayāḷam means 'to consider' [in works like KG and Eḻ], but Tamil ńaṇṇ-signifies 'to be attached to'.

പിണങ്ങ് piṇaṅṅ- in Malayāḷam means 'to be at sulks' 'to break off relations', while Tamil piṇaṅg-signifies only 'to be intertwined.'

āy-as in പോരിനാഞ്ഞുവന്ന് pōrin-āññu [Irupatt. Rām., 7, 7] shows a generalised meaning.

Malayalam ഉഴറ് uḻaṛ- signifies 'to go in a hurry' 'to be in a hurry', while the Tamil word means 'to move about', 'to be disturbed', etc.

(d) The following are compounds peculiar to Malayāḷam:—

Old ചെവിക്കോൾ cevi-k-koḷ-, യാത്രാക്ക് yātṟākk-, വേറിരിക്ക vēṟirikk, കോളപ്പെട്ട് kōḷapped-, നീക്കോൾ n'īkkoḷ.

Old and New Malayāḷam മതിവര് madivar-, മതിയാക് madi-y-āg-, ചാഞ്ചാട് cāñcāḍ- [perhaps influenced by Skt. cāncalya], താലോട് talōḍ, പിടിപെട് piḍi-peḍ-.

കരയേറ് kara-y-ēṟ-, കരേറ് karēṟ-, കേറ് kēṟ-, കയറ് kayaṟ- 'to climb'.

kayaṟ- or kēṟ- 'to climb' does not occur in US, in Līl., in the works of Niraṇam Paṇikkars, in RC or in Eḻ's works; on the other hand, the exclusive form in these works is the full compound karayēṟ- or its Mal. contraction karēṟ-.

karēṟ- has disappeared from the modern speech [completely, perhaps, from about the beginning of the 19th century]. kēṟ-, kayaṟ-began to appear by about the beginning of the New Mal. era, and gradually ousted the older karēṟ- and karayēṟ-.

kara-y-ēṟ- has the literal meaning 'to get ashore' and the figurative meanings 'to be saved' 'to attain salvation' in Middle Tamil. In Mal., the signification had early developed into the generalised idea of 'ascending' 'climbing', used both literally and figuratively. Structurally, it appears both as kara-y-ēṟ and as karēṟ-. US [e. g., 1, 21], the Paṇikkars [e. g. KR, Utt., 324], RC [e. g., 719], thc campus and Eḻ exclusively use karayēṟ or karēṟ;kayaṟ or kēṟ is not to be met with in any of these texts.

മറു കരെ കരയേറുവാനായ് maṟu kare karayēṟuvānāy [Bhāg, p. 50] shows how karēṟ- had become a well-fused compound not merely in structure but in meaning too, since the original force [1] of kara of karēṟ should have been lost sight of in a phrase like this.

A Travancore State document, writfen in the colloquial style of the early 16th century has മണ്ഡപത്തിൽ കരയേറി maṇḍapattil karayēṟi [KSP, I, p. 24].

I find a few instances cf കയറ kayaṟ- beside karēṟ- in Bh Bh, [e. g. in volume 2, p. 12], but I do not know whether these words may not have been introduced by the editor who had to fill up

1 cf. തെൻകരയേറുക [KR, Kisk, 297] where the literal meaning is conspicuous.

several gaps in editing this volume. One may roughly say that, till about the time of Eḻuttaśśan, karēṟ- was used in literature to the exclusion of kayāṟ- or kēṟ-. One of the editions of Pūndanam's Jñānappāna shows an instance of kayaṟ-. This was in the sixteenth century i. e. the period of Eḻ. who (let it be said) avoids using kayaṟ- or kēṟ-. The 17th century Paḍappāṭṭu [p. 25] uses karēṟ-; VR has both forms [pp. 3 and 269]; Kuñjan in the 18th century uses the older karēṟ- [ആൽത്തറമേൽ കരേറി, OT, p. 19; ഗളമതിൽ മാല കരേററി വരിക്കും galamadil māla karēṟṟi varikkum, OT, p. 71], beside kēṟ- [മടിയിൽ കേറും madiyil kēṟum, OT, p. 60]; Rāmapurattu Vāriyar uses both kayaṟ- and kēṟ- [Kuc. vañji]. Today, karēṟ- has disappeared from the colloquial, and kayaṟ- or kēṟ- alone is used.

kayaṟ-or kēṟ- 'to ascend' is non-existent in any of the Dravidian speeches. It is noteworthy that the verb kayaṟ-in Mal. is of comparatively late occurrence in the texts [perhaps colloquial, to begin with] and that it gradually replaced karēṟ-of the older texts. In view of these facts I am inclined to ask whether kēṟ-may not have been popularly derived from karēṟ- through colloquial forms like കരെക്കേറു karaikkēṟu [cf. കരെക്കേറി in Bh Bh, 2, p. 73 and Kuñjan's കരക്കേറി karakēṟi- in Irup. Bhāg., 21, 30] which may have been wrongly regarded as being constituted of kara and kēṟ, though really karaikkēṟ- is karaikk-[the dative of kara] followed by ēṟ-.

In the formation of popular kayaṟ-with the meaning 'to climb as with a rope,' the noun kayaṟu 'rope' [Tam. kayir] may have also exercised some influence.

2. Unique Mal. verb-forms derived from bases common to Tam. and Mal:—

(a) al and il regarded as kuṟippuvinai bases show in Tam. the conj. participles allādu, illādu, anṟi and inṟi ; the rel. participles allāda, illāda ; alan, ilan, alen, ilen, etc. with personal endings ; and the generalised negative particles alla and illai.

Mal. has, besides all these except the conj. participles anṟi and the forms with the personal endings, developed a few unique formations with tense-affixes.

അല്ലായുന്നു allāyuṅṅu	ഇല്ലായുന്നു illāyuṅṅu
അല്ലാഞ്ഞു allāññu	ഇല്ലാഞ്ഞു illāññu
or	or
അല്ലയാഞ്ഞു allayāññu	ഇല്ലയാഞ്ഞു illayāññu
അല്ലായ്കിൽ allāygil	ഇല്ലായ്കിൽ illāygil
or	or
അല്ലയായ്കിൽ allayāygil	ഇല്ലയായ്കിൽ illayāygil
അല്ലായ്ക allāyga	ഇല്ലായ്ക illāyga
	ഇല്ലായ്വാൻ illāyvān
	ഇല്ലായുമ്പോൾ illāyumbōḷ

For the structure of these forms, see below.

For Mal. ind'i, ind'i-y-e, eṅṅi, eṅṅi-y-ē from the conjunctive participle ind'i, see Chap. V, 2.

(b) aridu signifying 'what is difficult, scarce' in Tam. is connected with ār- in ār-uyir, etc., and with ariya.

Mal., has arudu corresponding to Tam. aridu, besides ār- precious < 'scarce' in compounds like ār-ōmal, and ariya as in ariya puṇyam [KBhr, p. 124], ariya tapasigaḷ [ib.]. arippam 'scarcity' [Tam. aruppam] is another word which Old Mal. has, as in പരവതിനരിപ്പം paravadin-arippam [KBhr, p. 118].

This base is represented in other Dravidian languages also:—Telugu aridi 'what is rare, difficult to attain'; Kann.: aridu.

Besides the idea of 'difficulty' or 'impossibility' the semantic variation [1] of 'undesirability' or 'prohibition' exists for arudu in Mal. when it is associated with the older infinitive participle, as in ചെയ്യരുത് ceyyarudu. In the works of the Paṇikkars, instances of the ceyyarudu type signify either 'difficulty' or 'prohibition' according to the context; in US and KG the contexts indicating 'prohibition' are non-existent. In Eḷ, both meanings are conveyed. In the later texts, the semantic development of 'prohibition' becomes more and dominant, though instances do continue to exist with the older meaning. In present-day Mal., the ceyyarudu type signifies only 'prohibition'.

This semantic evolution is true only of the type constituted of the old infinitive participle and arudu ; the types of ചെയ്യാന

1 When the "impossibility" is consciously created by an external agency, "prohibition" is the result.

തു് ceyvānarudu and of ചെയ്‌വതിന്നരുതു് ceyvadinn-arudu (existing in literary Mal. but not in the modern colloquial), only signify 'difficulty' or 'impossibilily'.

In Mal., arud has also been treated from an early time as a verb-base capable of being conjugated with "negative" terminations and tense-affixes [for which, see below].

അരുതായുന്റതു arudāyuṉṟadu [R C, 746].

അരുതാഞ്ഞ് arudāññ- [R C, 132].

അരുതാത arudāda [R C, 34].

അറിയരുതാതെ aṛi-y-arudāde [T A S, IV, p. 46].

അരുതായ്‌വാൻ arudāyvān [K R, Utt., 200].

അരുതായ്ക arudāyga

All these, except arudātta, have now gone out of use from the colloquial.

(c) Some Mal. specialities of the verb-forms of uḷ may be noted here:—

(i) As in Early Middle Tam. [cf. N, 339], uṇḍu [the third person "neuter" singular of uḷ] is employed from the earliest period in connection with all genders, numbers and persons: ñān iviḍe uṇḍu [K Bhr]; gandharvakulōttamar uṇḍu [KR, Kiṣk., 211]. Echoes, however, of the Old Tam. usage are heard in the texts down till the New Mal. period: uḷan, uḷar, uḷanāyēn, uḷaḷāyāḷ, uḷanāyān, uḷarāyār. ulav-āg-'to come to exist' appears to be a special Mal. formation.

(ii) uṇdu is employed in modern Mal. in a larger number of contexts than in Tamil.

ā manuṣyan aviḍe uṇḍu 'that man is there' would have to be expressed in Tamil by a-m-maniḍan aṅg-irukkān.

കളിച്ചുണ്ടു് kaḷiccuṇḍu [K G], and common വരുന്നുണ്ടു varuṉṟuṇḍu 'is coming', വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടു vaṉṟiṭṭ-uṇḍu 'has come', വന്നിട്ടുണ്ടായിരുന്നു vaṉṟiṭṭ-uṇḍ-āy-iruṉṟu 'had come', കേൾപ്പുണ്ടു് kēḷ-p-p-uṇḍu 'is heard' [US, 1, 19], വരുവാൻ ഉണ്ടു varuvān uṇḍu 'is yet to come', illustrate some of the varied uses to which uṇḍu has been put in Mal.

ഉണ്ടുള്ളു uṇḍ-uḷḷu is an old form occurring in KG.

(iii) Another peculiar Mal. use of uṇḍu is illustrated by the following:—

എന്നാൽ നിങ്ങൾ ഒന്നുണ്ടു വേണ്ടു en̄n̄āl n̄iṅṅaḷ on̄n̄-uṇḍu vēṇḍū [BhBh, 1, p. 107].

മൂന്നു നാൾ ഉണ്ടു കണ്ടു mūn̄n̄u n̄āḷ uṇḍu kaṇḍū [US, 2, 80].

മന്നവൻ യുധിഷ്ഠിരൻ തന്നേയും ഉണ്ടോ കണ്ടു mannavan yudhiṣṭhiran tannēyum uṇḍō kaṇḍu [Eḷ Bh].

(iv) Forms like the following explain the origin of modern colloquial ēdāṇḍu, ārāṇḍu, eṅṅāṇḍu:—

ദൈവം ഏതാനും ഉണ്ടു കല്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു daivam edānum-uṇḍu kalpiccirikkun̄n̄u [BhBh, 1, p. 28].

ആരാനുമുണ്ടോ കണ്ടു ārānum-uṇḍō kaṇḍu [Rām. Camp., Sugr., 58].

ഏതാനും ഉണ്ടു ഞാൻ കൊണ്ടന്നു edānum uṇḍu n̄ān koṇḍan̄n̄u [K G, Vals., l. 443].

എങ്ങാനുണ്ടോ പണ്ടു ഉളവായി eṅṅān-uṇḍō paṇḍ-uḷavāy [O T, p. 89].

(d) വൽ val 'to be able' a so-called "defective" verb appearing in a few Tamil forms is represented in Mal. by quite a large number of forms:—

(i) The negatives വല്ലേൻ vallēn [colla vallēn of the campus, for instance], വല്ലാർ vallār [poga vallār of KG], വല്ലായ്മ vallāyma [Tam. vallāmai], വല്ലാതെ vallāle 'not being able' have corresponding forms in Tamil. vallān, vallār, vallēn in Tamil, however, have both affirmative and negative meanings; Mal. vallān and vallār are exclusively negative.

(ii) The following Mal. forms, constructed according to characteristic Mal. principles of formation, are somewhat unique:—

വല്ലാഞ്ഞു vallāññu
വല്ലുന്നതില്ല vallun̄n̄adilla [KG, Vals., l. 1536].
ചൊല്ലവല്ലൂ colla vallū [KG, Kṛṣṇōlp., l. 548].
വല്ലുവൻ ഞാൻ valluvan n̄ān [US, 2, 26].
വല്ലീല vallīla [K G, Vals., l. 1443].
വല്ലുകയില്ല valluga-y-illa [Bhāg, p. 80]

(iii) വല്ല valla, the kuṛippuvinai relative participle is used in Tam. only with the meaning 'that which is able', as in Naccinārkiniyar's vāśittal valla pāṇanum, but in Mal. from the earliest known times down till today, valla and the forms vallavan, vallavaḷ, valladu derived from valla are used only with a unique semantic "generalisation":—

വല്ലവണ്ണം valla vaṇṇam 'in some manner' [RC, 49].

വരുമോ ഭർത്താ വല്ല പ്രകാരം varumō bhaṛttā valla prakāram Would my husband come somehow?' [KR, Sund, 109].

വല്ലകാര്യം valla kāryam [CBh].

വല്ലകണക്കിലും valla kaṇakkilum [Eḷ Bh]. This use of valla and of forms like 'vallavan some man', vallavaḷ 'some woman' vallavar 'some person', valladu 'something' is common today in Mal.

(iv) Among the other forms of val, the only ones retained in the modern colloquial are the following; and even in these forms the primary meanings with which they were used in Old Mal. have undergone slight semantic alterations:—

വല്ലാത്ത vallātta in the modern colloquial means generally 'what is not capable of being dealt with, untractable, unmanageable'.Cf. വല്ലാത്തേശനിവാക്കുകൾ vallātt-ēṣaṇivākkugaḷ [Sabhā]; വല്ലാത്തൊരബദ്ധം vallātt-ōr-abaddham [Sabhā, l. 939].

വല്ലാണ്ട് vallāṇḍ[- < vallade koṇḍ-] in contexts like വല്ലാണ്ടായ് vallāṇḍāy would mean 'became helpless, physically, mentally, financially or otherwise'.

(e) ol, as a variant of val, appears in the following Mal. forms:—

പരുഷം പറവതിവളോടൊല്ലാ paruṣam paṛavad-ivaḷōḍ-ollā [KR Sund, 118], ചെയ്യൊല്ലാതെ ceyyollāde [KG, Kṛṣṇōlp., l. 234], പോകൊല്ലാഞ്ഞു pog-ollāññu [KG, Gōp., 2, l. 118], ചെയ്യൊല്ലാ ceyyollā [a type existing both in Old and in New Mal.], ഒല്ലാത്ത കാര്യം ഓരായ്ക ollāda kāryam ōrāyga [Eḷ Bh.]

Tamil has forms like ollāyē [Puṛam, 31], ollān [ib., 78]· ollādu [Kuṛaḷ], ollum, olvadu, ollā [Kuṛaḷ].

The Mal. forms ollāññu [Neg. finite verb], ollāde [as a Neg. Imp.], ceyyollā [as a general prohibitive] are all peculiar to this west coast dialect.

(f) en- 'to say' is represented in modern colloquial Mal. only by the following forms, all of which have ceased to convey the original verbal idea of 'saying' as such, and convey only certain generalised syntactic significations:—

എന്നു് enṟu [as a syntactic expletive].

എന്നാൽ enṟāl ['but' 'however'; and as in rāman enṟāl āru, etc.].

എങ്കിൽ eṅgil 'if'.

എന്ന enṟa [as in enṟapōle, enṟavan, puli enṟa mṛgam, etc.]

The primary verbal idea, however, is conspicuous in forms employed in the older texts:—

എന്മേടം enmēḍam 'while saying' [RC]

എന്മർ emmar 'they will say' [Līl., 4, 7, cit.]

എന്നാദു് ennādu 'not saying' [KR, Utt., 330]

എന്നുമ്പോൾ ennumbōḷ [KG]

എന്നു കേചന enṟu kēcana [Campus]

എന്നാർ 'they said' [Eḻ Bh]

എന്മാൻ enmān 'for the purpose of' [Eḻ Bh]

എന്നാൾ മന്നോജന്മാംശി enṟāḷ[Irupatt. Rām., 5, 6]

എന്നാർ enṟār 'they said' [Naḷ. Ātt., p. 417]

എന്നു enṟu [ib.]

എന്മാനില്ല enmānilla [ib., p. 434]

ena, the old infinitive participle, appears as ene in Cākkyār bhāṣā, but its primary signification has become discoloured.

ena with semantic discoloration and structural modification exists in forms like Old Mal. cikkane, and Old and New Mal. poḍuṉṟane.

(g) The following contexts in which forms of āg-are employed, are somewhat unique developments in Mal.

(i) āvu 'would be possible' [the aorist with ū], āvō [<āvu + ō] having the force of 'I don't know'.

(ii) In instances like paran'n'ūdāy, [KG, Gōp., l. 530], വന്നൂതായ് vanṟūdāy [ib., Kṛṣṇōlp., l. 250], āy, the past finite is a reinforcer.

(iii) āy, the conjunctive past participle, serves a number of syntactic functions in Mal:—āy -k -koṇḍu with the signification of different 'casal' endings [avanum-āy pōy (3rd case); avanōḍ -āy-k-koṇḍu paṟaññu (communicative case); avannāy-k-koṇḍu ṅalgi (4th case)]; āy in the compound formations [āyirikkuṅṅu, āyiruṅṅu, āyirikkum, and their connected verb-forms]; āyāvu [as in KG ആണുങ്ങളായാവൂ ഞങ്ങൾ āṇuṅṅaḷ āyāvū ṅaṅṅaḷ 'how we wish we became males!'].

(iv) ām [āgum], the future relative participle, in the syntactic collocation āmāṟu [ām-āṟu] so frequently appearing in Old Mal. and Eḻ; and -āmadu in contexts like raṇḍ-ām-adu.

(v) ārān [Mokṣad., l. 6] 'somebody', with its final ān derived from the concessive ān-um [see the section on "Conditionals and Concessives" below.]

(vi) The suffix -vān as in uṇḍō-vān, expressive of 'doubt or 'surprise', derived from -ān [< āyin, the conditional (with -in) of āg-], with the permanent incorporation of a dorsal glide.

(vii) Compound forms constituted of the old infinitive participle and -āg, like kāṇ-āg, ceyy-āg, na'ḍakk-āg, were common in Old Mal. and in all the earlier stages of New Mal.

The following forms of this type are frequently met with in the texts:—കാണാകുന്നു kāṇāguṅṅu, കാണായ് kāṇāy, the future കാണാകും kāṇāgum always contracted to കാണാം kāṇām and used (also today) syntactically with special significations [see below], കാണാകിൽ kāṇāgil, കാണാകേണം kāṇāgēṇam.

(viii) āvu in optatives like puṇarṅṅāvu, kaṇḍāvu, vaṅṅā-vūdu, etc.

3. I give below a few of the prominent verb-bases which once were current in Malayāḷam but which have now practically disappeared:—

kēḷ-, karēṟ-, ōr- 'to consider', vāykk-'to increase', amar kiḍaikk-, īḻkk- 'to drag', nūḻ- [past stem nūṇ- < nūḻnd-], por-'to fight' [modern porud-], piḷug-, māḷg-, iyal-, vīy-, tāv-, vel-, taḷug-, ulāv-[mod. ulātt-] pāṟkku- [as in tṛkkaṇ pāṟkk-, etc], ēś-, ṅaṇṇ-, peṇṇ-[in Ceṟuśśēri's works, particularly], igal kiṭṭ-, kuṟi-k-koḷ-, cevi-k-koḷ-, oṅṅ- [as a verb], yātṟākk,

aṟaikk-, mīḷ, tiga-kk-'of milk, to be boiled', ceññ-to become red,' iṟa-kk- 'to die' [in Eḻ Bh], poli-kk-, uḻaṟ-, iḷai-kk-, mugai-kk-, kaḻi-kk- [as in kaṇṭham piriccu kaḻikk-], iyal-, pulamb-, ōl, mett-, tañj-, tōy, parug-, pēś, payaṯṯ-, vaya-kk-, ēg-, ūkk-uḻal-, talapped, kōḻapped-, kōl-, taṇped- ,cuvatt-,mig-.

4. The following transitival verb-bases which form their past stems with -tt have fallen into desuetude in New Malayāḷam, having been replaced by transitival bases [having -tt-] which form their past stems with-i-.

Bases with semi-permanent kārita-kk-. Past stems with-tt-.	Bases with-tt-; Past stems with-i.
(1) അറുതിപെടുക്കുന്നവൻ aṟudi pedukkunnavan [KR, Ār., 117 and K G] —	pedu-tt-i-
കൊലപ്പെടുത്തു kola-p-peduttu KG, Kṛṣṇōlp., l. 674]	
(2) ഉയർത്തവനെ uyaṟttavane [KR, Bāl., 26] —	uyaṟ-tt-i-
(3) താഴ്ത്തടും tāḻttadum [KR, Ār,22] —	tāḻ-tt-i-
(4) വളർത്തേൻ vaḷaṟttēn [KR, Bāl., 249] —	vaḷaṟ-tt-i-
(5) അമർക്കാം amaṟkkām [Candr., 3, 97], കരം അമർത്തു karam amaṟttu [Eḻ Bh] —	amar-tt-i
(6) തളർപ്പടിന്നു taḷaṟppadiññu [K G] —	taḷaṟ-tt-i
(7) നിവിർത്തു n iviṟttu [Kir. Kiḷipp., 4, l. 29] —	n'ivaṟ-tt-i
(8) നിരച്ചു n'iraccu [Naiṣ. camp.] —	n'iratt-i-
(9) വിടുത്തു viduttu [KG, Vals., l. 734] —	vidaṟ-tt-i-

Among these, pedukku-was almost exclusive in the texts down till the New Malayāḷam period; tāḻkk-, uyaṟkk-, n'iraikk-, n'iviṟkk- are all purely Old Malayāḷam bases, while the past forms of vaḷaṟkk-, amaṟkk-and pedukk were occasionally used by New Malayāḷam writers [cf.OT, p. 464 amaṟttum; vaḷaṟttu in ib., p. 482; kodi vaḷaṟkkum in Koṭṭār.Āṭṭ., p. 100].

It may be noted that the bases with-tt (having their past with-i-) already existed in Early Middle Tamil and in Old Malayāḷam.

5. The formation of transitival verb-bases from intransitive ones in Malayāḷam is in the main guided by the same rules as in Tamil.

So far as causatives proper in Malayāḷam are concerned, Malayāḷam is in agreement with Middle Tamil.

The most common and frequent method of causatival formation in Malayāḷam is illustrated by the following instances occurring in the old texts and inscriptions:—

ചെയ്യിച്ചു ceyyiccu, ചെയ്യിക്കക്കടവർ ceyyikka-k-kaḍavar[TAS, V, p. 35— 10th c.]

ചെലുത്തിച്ചു celutticcu [TAS, II, p. 49 —10th c.].

ചേവിച്ചു cēviccu [= ceyviccu] } [TAS, IV, p. 151—13th c.]
മേവിച്ചു mēviccu [= mēyviccu] }

നടത്തിച്ചു n'aḍatticcu }
ഏററിച്ചു ēṫṫiccu }
എറക്കിച്ചു eṛakkiccu } [TAS, IV, p. 86—13th c.]
എഴുന്നള്ളിച്ചു eḻuṅṅaḷḷiccu }

വിടുവിച്ചു viḍuviccu [ib.];

വിടുവിപ്പാൻ viḍuvippān [Bh Bh, I, p. 28].

പുറപ്പെടുവിച്ചും puṛappeḍuviccum [BhBh, I, p. 67].

ഇടിയിച്ചത് iḍiyiccadu [<iḍu-vi-ccadu] [CAR, II, p. 16].

കഴിയിപ്പിച്ചോർ kaḻiyippiccār [<kaḻivi-ppiccār] [Naiṣ. camp.]

ചെയ്യിക്കേണമെന്നു ceyyikkēṇamen'n'u and ചെയ്വിച്ചു ceyviccu in 17th c. Travancore dynastic records [KSP, I, p 22].

അരുളിവിച്ചു aruḷiviccu [KSP, I, p. 23].

തൊടിയിച്ചു toḍiyiccu [Girij., p. 20[

The ചെയ്യിക്ക് ceyyikk- type is, I think, normally descended from Middle Tamil [1] ceyvikk- for the following reasons:—

(i) -vi definitely appears in Mal. വിടുവിക്ക് viḍuvikk-, പുറപ്പെടുവിക്ക് puṛappeḍuvikk-, though the rapid colloquial has വിടീക്ക് viḍīkk-, etc.

(ii) Phonetically, -u-vi or -vi may become reduced to ī or i on account of the unstable nature of the bilabial v. For the instability of v, cf. Mal. tōlvi > tōli

,, kēḷvi > kēḷi

,, ōḍuvān > ōḍān

,, pāḍuvin > pāḍin

1 An early Middle Tamil inscription of the 11th century [SII, II, p. 106] shows ചെയ്വിത്ത "having caused to be inscribed".

(iii) The occurrence of -pp-i in the causatives of Kārita bases points to the old sandhi of -kk [Kārita affix] + v-i = -pp-i [see my DS].

A very important point in connection with Mal. causatives like ceyyikk- and viḍuvikk-, is their immediate relationship with Tam. causative bases with -vi- and -ppi-. Now, these causative endings are conspicuous by their absence in Old Tamil. None of the Śaṅgam works show such bases, except Paripāḍal which, as I have shown in my MOTV, evidences some linguistic peculiarities of the Middle Tamil period. It is in the works of the Āḻwars and the Śaivites that causative bases with -vi-, -bi- and -ppi- crop up abundantly in Tamil literature. The primary causative affix -vi- [-bi-and -ppi- are sandhi-modified variants] was perhaps isolated as such from original formations of the type of pāḍu-v-i, in which the causative force was conferred by ī [shortened afterwards], the v immediately before it arising as a glide after the back vowel u. The existence in Old Tamil of causatives with ī, i directly annexed to the base as in koḷī with its [conjunctive participle appearing as koḷ-ī-i], which in later literature [cf. Nālaḍi] assumes the form koḷ-u-v- strengthens this suggestion regarding the origin of the Middle Tamil causative affix vi-.

It is remarkable that the Mal. causatives are directly related to these Midde Tamil affixes.

2. PERSONAL ENDINGS OF TENSE FORMS.

1. The earliest texts and inscriptions generally use tense-forms with personal endings corresponding to those of Middle Tamil, though there are not wanting instances illustrating the absence of personal terminations.

These endings are the following:—

First person sing. ēn, future an; pl. ōm. [1]

Second ,, ,, āy, ā (with the elision of -y). pl. īr.

Third "rational sing." ān, āḷ; pl. ār [and ar for the future].

,, "irrational" sing. adu; and, rarely, pl. a, ava, ana.

---

1 Old Tamil had no ഓം; Old Malayalam texts, wherever they use the first person pl. termination, have only ഓം.

It will be noted that these personal endings are all Middle Tamil ones; the Old Tamil. -an-en, -an-am, -an-ai, -an-ir, -an-an, -an-ar, -anṟu [i.e., with the cariyai -an followed by personal endings with short vowels] are absent in Mal. except in what one might regard as a few unique Tamilisms [1] as in മൊഴിന്തനൻ moḻind-an-an [RC, 11], പുകുന്തനൻ pugund-an-an [KR, Ār. 11].

Nor does Mal. have the Old Tamil future first person singular -al, in the stead of which the west coast dialect uses the corresponding Middle Tamil -an.

2. The y of the second person singular -āy, was often elided in Old Mal. :—

വെന്റാ vend'ā, മാററിനാ māṯṯinā [US, 1, 40]
വസിച്ചാ vasiccā [KR, Kiṣk. 102]
ചെയ്വാ ceyvā [K Bhāg. p. 267]
നീയും മറന്നാ maṟannā [Rām camp, Sugr. , 65]
പാരാ pārā [Imp., in KR]

3. Though personal endings for tense-forms were common in the Old Mal. texts, there do exist instances in these texts of finites without personal terminations. This absence of terminations gradually affects more and more categories of finites with the passing of time. There is a gradualness in the dropping of personal endings from period to period. As will be seen below, all the types for which personal endings are envisaged by Līl. do not have these endings in KG, and not all the types of KG showing personal endings are represented in Eḻ. This gradualness may have been purely literary; but it is quite possible that it may have mirrored, though chronologically at belated stages, a gradually increasing tendency in the regional and communal colloquials to drop these personal endings.

4. I shall first give instances from the texts of tense-forms without personal terminations.

(a) US has some like the following: ആരിയപ്പട്ടർ പോയി āriyap-paṭṭar pōyi [2, 45];—ഏതൽവംശം ഉണ്ടായിപോൽ ētal vamśam uṇḍāyi pōl [1, 26], പൂങ്കോഴികൂകി pūṅgōḻi kūgi [1,6].

---

1 Lil. I, 1, comm., points out that the -an- [described in Tamil grammars as a ചാരിയൈ or augment] in മൊഴിന്തനൻ etc. is absent in Mal.

As for the types of personal endings employed in US for tense-forms, see below.

(b) It would be interesting to examine the value of the evidence furnished by the fourteenth-century grammar Līl. on the question of personal endings for tense-forms.

(i) Śilpa 2, 24, comm, refers to forms with and without personal endings.

(ii) Śilpa 2, 25, comm., expressly adverts to the absence of personal endings in the "neuter" tense-forms more than in the others.

(iii) In the citations furnished by the commentaries, there are instances of the absence of personal endings for tense-forms:—

അടേ! കണ്ടു ade! kaṇḍu [3, 8]
ചെഞ്ഞീകടാക്ഷം ceññī kaṭākṣam [4, 2]
അതുവെളിയായ്" adu veḷiyāy [4, p. 49]
ഞാനും ഒൻറ" അല്ലലായ് ñānum-ond'-allalāyī [ib.]

(iv) The personal endings allowed expressly or impliedly by this grammar are of many types, not being restricted to a few as in Eḷ (for which, see below). Instances exist like വീഴ്"വോം vīḻvom[7, p. 54]; താരാനോ tārānō [neg.-7, p. 54]; മിണ്ടാൾ miṇḍāḷ [4, p. 39]; നിർമ്മിയാഞ്ഞാൻ nirmmiyāññān [4, p. 38]; ഉണ്മർ uṇmar, വരുവർ varuvar, കൊൾവർ koḷvar [future form—1, 1,comm.].

Third personal present tense forms with personal endings appear in Līl., as in other Mal. texts, only as participials:—ഉണ്ണിന്റോർ uṇṇiṉṟōr is given in 1, 1, comm., as corresponding to the Tam.present tense form ഉണ്ണാനിൻറാനർ uṇṇāṉind'anar which latter form is impliedly prohibited for Mal. by Līl. here. [Kaṇṇaśśan's use of വളരാനിൻറ" vaḷarāṉind'-, ചൊല്ലാനിൻറ" collāṉind'- (see below) is definitely therefore an imitation of Tam. usage].

(v) A very significant observation is made by Līl. in the commentary on the third sūtra of the second śilpa:—nanu "vandān" "irundān".. ityādikam bhāṣante keraḷā hīnajātīyāh "(it may be said that) low castes in Malabar do say "vandān" "irundān."

Though the context in which this incidental observation is made refers to the consonant group ṉd (and its Mal. develop-

ment ṟṟ), the fact that the author (or the commentator) attributes forms like these with personal endings to the "low castes" of Malabar is, I think, significant in indicating that the personal endings had not during this period completely disappeared in all communal colloquials. Apparently, the development of characteristic Mal. features had not been uniform in all communal (and regional) colloquials.

(c) Some instances from RC are the following:— നകന്റ മുടിക്കന്റ ചോണിതമേ mudikkuṟṟu [706]; കടലും കലുങ്ങി kuluṅṅi [773]; വൊറപ്പു വന്റ vaṟṟu [392]; കരാം എതിൎത്തു edirttu [212]. There are also instances in which the expletive idu appears instead of the personal endings: നിലച്ചിതക്കപികുലങ്കളു nilaccid-a-k-kapikulaṅgaḷum [362], etc.

(d) KR [1] has instances, like the following, without personal terminations for finite tense-forms:—

ഭ്രുതലം ഇളകി iḷagi [Bāl., 228]., വിറച്ചിതു ഗിരികൾ viṟaccidu [228], പുകഞ്ഞിതാശകൾ pugaññid-āśagaḷ [228]; വിപ്രവരന്മാർ ആശി കൾ കൂറി āśigaḷ kūṟi [282]; വിശ്വാമിത്രൻ എഴുന്നരുളി eḻuṉṉaruḷi [63]; ദേവകൾ കൂടി kūḍi [62]; ജഗത്തു് നടുങ്ങി ṉaḍuṅṅi [62]; മുനിശ്രേഷ്ഠാദികളെല്ലാം ഓടി ōḍi [83]; വീടി മഹാനിയമങ്ങൾ അനത്തും വിശ്വാമിത്രൻ vīḍi mahāniyamaṅṅaḷ anattum viśwāmitran [234].

എഴുന്നരുളി eḻuṉṉaruḷi [KR, Utt., 137], കുറവുണ്ടായോ kuṟav-uṇḍāy-ō [ib., 200], നിശിചരകുലവരൻ അതിബലവാനായൊ niśicara-kulavaran atibalavān-āyō [ib.].

(e) Early inscriptional instances without the personal endings, though rare, do exist:—

കല്പിച്ചു kalpiccu [TAS, VII, p. 112—14th c.]; പണിയും ചേ വിച്ചു cēviccu [<° ceyviccu-TAS, IV, p. 151—13th c.]; മേവിച്ചു mēviccu [< mēyviccu ib.]

5. Now I proceed to classify the types of tenses in which the personal terminations occur in the texts from US downwards.

(a) US has the following types:—

1st person sing. and pl. past endings: vārttappeṭṭēn [1,24], tēṟinōm ṅaṅṅaḷ [1,33], kaṇḍōm [2,94].

1st person future sing. with an: erivan [2,88], aḷalvan [ib.].

---

1 K Bhag. has very many instances of finites without personal endings or with only the expletive idu.

2nd person sing. past :—ādi-k-koṇḍā, cend'ā [2, 46]; māṯṯinā, vend'ā [1, 40]. The elision of final-y- is noteworthy; such forms occur in RC, in the works of the Paṇikkars and in the earlier campus.

3rd person past endings:— vaṉṉān vasantam [1,8], kond'ān [1,10] ōḍipponāḷ [1,29], ūṇumkuḷiyum vaigund'udallō [2, 2],

For the present tense, only the first person singular is met with: toḻind'ēn [1,39].

The second person plural īr of all tenses and the third person "irrational" plural ending -a-n-a- or-a are not met with in US.

Among the negatives, the third person -ā [used for singular and plural] occurs: tārā [2,45], oppam ṉillā [2,51], kāṇam pōrā [2,57], vārāṉidra [2,91]

One instance of vallēn occurs [1st person] in 2,51 ; and in 1,55 there occurs pōrādō.

idu as expletive for all persons:—ñānvaḷañ ñund'iḍu [1,108], kāyaṅkuḷavar mukkarikkind'udāgil [1,93].

(b) Līlātilakam envisages many types:—

The commentary on Sūtra 25 of Śilpa II refers to vand'ēn; vand'ōm and vand'ēm; vaṉṉā(y); vaṉṉīr; vaṉṉana, pōyana; varind'ēn and varind'ōn; kāṇuṉṉīr; kāṇind'ā(y)

It may be observed that the first person plural-ēm should have been purely a Tamilism since (so far as I can see) this ending in Malayāḷam texts appears always as -ōm.

The commentary on Sūtra 1 of Śilpa I refers to uṇḍār; uṇmar, koḷvar; uṇṇind'ōr. uṇṇind'ōr is a participial treated more or less as a finite; it may be noted that the third person "rationals" in the present tense show in Malayāḷam only participials of this type (and not forms like pōguṉṉān, etc.), whenever personal endings appear.

Among the passages cited in Līl., instances (like the following) of tense-forms with personal endings occur:—

Future : kāṇmanō [IV, 6], arivan [IV,17]; vīḷvōm; emmar [IV,7].

Past ; kaṇḍēn [IV, 15]; maṟaṉṉāḷ; kaṇḍā [VII, 9].

Present : aññjind'ēn [VII,7].

Aorist negatives : vallēn [VIII, 5]; tārān [VII,5], miṇḍāḷ [IV,23].

(c) In RC, the following types are met with:—

Present : First person sing. and pl.: collind'ōm [29], muḍikkuṟṟōm [563].

Second person sing.: muḍikkuṟṟāyō [802].

Third person sing. and pl.: only as participials like vīḻtturṟōr [344].

Past : First person sing. common.

Second person sing: maṟaṟṟā(y) [646], connāy [84].

Third person "rational" sing. and pl. common.

„ "irrational" pl. vīḻndana [192], pagayttana [211].

Future : First person sing. with -an common.

„ plural: kiṭṭuvōm, oḍukkuvōm [42].

Second person sing. ṟaragattil-iḷavāy [647].

Third „ pl: vīḻttuvar.

„ „ sing. and pl. irrationals only with -um.

Aorist negatives : First person sing. iḷayēnē [499]. Third person aḻiyān [49], aṟiyār [455].

For the expletive idu or udu appearing in the stead of personal endings, cf. ñāññaḷ pugundidu [101], arakkarn'aññjāy avan avadarittudu [73].

(d) The Niraṇam Paṇikkars employ all personal endings, except the third person "rational" present tense endings.

1st person :—pōguṟṟēn [KR, Bāl., 128], n'aḍaṟṟēn [KR, Ār., 48], ceyvōm [ib, 64], viḻuññuvan ñān [KR, Ār., 55], pugundōm [ib, 64], āgin'n'ōm [Kiṣk., 273].

2nd person :—n'ilppāy-ō [KR, Ār., 173], cinticcāy [ib., 192], ceydā [with elision of final-y, Kiṣk., 98]; connīr [ib. 320].

3rd person :—ṟiṟṟana, n'iraṟṟana [neuter pl., KR, Kiṣk., 143], connān [KR, Ār., 4], urattār [ib., 12].

The forms for the third person "rational" present are sometimes participials with personal endings, but not the finite tense-forms proper :—narag-eydiṟṟōr [KR, Kiṣk., 171].

Negative aorist forms like vāḷēn [KR, Ār., 176], aṛiyōm [KR, Kiṣk., 256], oḷiyāy [KR, Kiṣk., 109], vārān [KR, Kiṣk., 263], vārār [ib.], poṛāḷ [ib., 269] occur.

The use of the neg. ending- ā for persons other than the third person "irrational" pl. is met with already :—sīta ṅinakku poruṅṅā [KR, Ār., 49], bhagavati tān avaḷk-ediroppā [ib., 131], piḷa vārā [KR, Bāl., 258].

Similarly, the characteristic Mal. negatives and the use of -illa for forming negatives also exist side by side with the above. The forms with-illa never show personal endings either here or in any Mal. texts whatsoever, unlike Middle Tamil.

Again, the expletive idu already appears in connection with tense-forms (without any other personal endings) of all persons :—mahākalpaka vṛkṣādigaḷ āyidu [KR, Bāl., 35], daśarathan koḍuttidu dānam [ib. 49].

(e) In the fifteenth century works like KG and the earlier campus, the instances without personal endings are so frequent that one is led to postulate the view that the spoken language may have cast off these personal endings (at least in many areas) before this period.

Even in the literary tradition permitting the optional use of personal endings, there appears to have crept in a change after the time of Līl.; for, in KG, forms with the personal endings -ana or -a (for the third person "irrational" plural), īr (second person plural), and the aorist negative endings āy (second person sing.), ōm (first person plural) and īr (second person plural) have fallen into disuse.

(f) Eḻuttaśśan who uses tense-forms with and without personal endings, employs these endings only for the first person singular past, present and future [-an for future and ēn for the past and the present], for the third person rational past and rarely for the second person past and present sing.,

ōm [1st pers. pl.], īr [2nd pers. pl.], -ana or a [3rd pers. neuter pl.] are absent; the present and future finites except for the first person sing., have no personal endings.

The only negative aorist ending, commonly employed for all persons and numbers, is -ā; others are absent, except the traditional vallēn, as in colla vallēn.

I have already adverted to the fact that KG does not show all the types of personal endings envisaged by Līl. By the time that the period of Eḷ is reached, a few other types also appear to have gone out of vogue in literature; for Eḷ does not have the following types not infrequent in KG:—Second person future sing., third person future plural like enmar, first person plurals with ōm, and the aorist negatives like n'illār, tārān, aṛiyāy.

Summing up, it may be said that

(a) there is a distinct difference between Old Mal. on the one hand and Eḷ on the other in the number and variety of the types of personal endings employed. The campus, KG and CBh already mark the transition in as much as they do not show all the types contemplated by Līl;

and (b) even in Old Mal., the following pecularities[1] point to the fact that personal endings for tense-forms may have largely disappeared from the colloquial, at least in certain areas:—

(i) the extensive use of forms without personal endings in KG, CBh and the campus;

(ii) the occurrence even in US, RC, KR, KBhr and K Bhāg of instances without personal endings;

(iii) the use of idu or udu as an expletive (in the stead of personal endings) for tense-forms of all persons, indicating that even in the literature of the time personal endings were on the "road to ruin";

(iv) the conspicuous absence in literature of personal endings for the third person present forms;

---

1 In some texts, the third personal ending is used in connection with finite verbs having other persons as their subjects:—

ഞങ്ങൾ ചൊൽവർ [K Bhāg, p 115]; ഞാൻഉളൻ [RC, 557]; നാം ഉളർ [KR, Utt., 4]; നാംപോരുവർ [KR, ഉത്തര 713]; നന്നായ് വഞ്ചിച്ച് പോനാൻ ഇന്നിങ്ങുഞാൻ [KG, Balabhadra., l. 43]; ചൊല്ലിനാൻ നീ [KG]; പൊറുപ്പൻ നീ poṛuppan n'ī [ib.]; പരിചരിച്ചീടുമാറാക്കിനാൻ നീ paricariccīḍumāṛ-ākkinān n'ī [Rām. Camp., Sitāpar., 80]; നീ മുതിർന്നിടിനാൻ n'ī mudiṛn'n'īḍinān [Kaly., 32]; നീ വരുത്തിനാൻ n'ī varuttinān [Naḷ. Āṭṭ].

(v) the gradual encroachment in Mal. by the -um future on "persons" other than the third person;

(vi) the explicit statement made by Līl that in Mal. literature, personal endings may or may not appear,—a fact which points possibly to the frequency of the absence of these endings in the colloquials.

It has been postulated that the absence of personal endings for tense-forms, characteristic of Mal., represents a stage anterior to that of the other Dravidian speeches all of which show personal endings. It has been claimed that personal endings never existed at all in the Mal. colloquial and that the appearance of these endings in early texts and documents was due to the influence of Tamil, which admittedly was predominant in the early history of Malabar.

One thing must surely be conceded: the use of all sorts of personal endings in the works of the Paṉikkars, or the envisaging by Līl of forms like vand'ēm, etc. can certainly not be reflective of the actual colloquial of the land, just as the presence of a few types of personal endings in Eḷ can in no way represent the colloquial of that period.

If personal endings existed in Mal., they must have disappeared from the colloquial (of at least a number of areas and communities) at an early period. This is indicated by (i) the existence even in the earliest texts of tense-forms without personal endings [see above for illustrations]; (ii) the explicit mention by the 14th century Līl. that personal endings were more frequently absent in "neuter" forms than in others,— a state of affairs which in all probability referred rather to literature than to the colloquial.

Having said this, I still think that there is no proof available for the position that the absence of the personal endings was a feature inherited by Mal. from the primitive Dravidian parent language, and that this lack of personal terminations therefore stands for a stage anterior to that of other Dravidian speeches.

What do we know, in the first place, of primitive Dravidian, except what could (very imperfectly indeed !) be reconstructed with the materials now available ? And, in view of the exis-

tence of numerous personal endings for tense-forms in all Dravidian languages except Mal., how could any reliance be placed upon mere *a priori* arguments to show that personal endings could not have been used in the primitive stages?

Secondly, even granting that primitive Dr. tolerated forms without personal endings, where is the proof for the position that Mal. inherited this feature? The condition of the West Coast speech before about the 9th and 10th centuries of the Xian era has now to reconstructed with the only help now available viz. Middle Tamil, to which Mal. is most intimately related. And Middle Tamil does have personal endings for tense-forms.

While therefore there is reason for us to think that personal endings for tense-forms may have disappeared from at least certain regional and communal colloquials of Mal. before the 13th century, there is absolutely no proof for the theory that this absence of personal endings dates back to the primitive Dravidian stage. On the other hand, due weight has to be given to considerations like the following:—

(i) Aminidīv Mal.,a dialect spoken by the Moplahs of the Aminidīv and Laccadīv islands, shows even today some personal endings, though in somewhat attenated and mutilated shapes. The following illustrations are taken from the Aminidive Mal. text of the "Parable of the Prodigal son", a gramaphone record of which has been taken and preserved under the orders of the Madras Government:—തിന്നിന്താൻ tinnindān, ചൊല്ലിന്താൻ collindān, ഹായതായിനേൻ hāyadāyinēn, ഞാൻ ചെയ്യോനായിന ñān ceydōnāyina.

(ii) The persistence and frequency with which the first person sing. future forms with -an occur in the texts, together with the fact that the-um future encroached upon the sphere of the first person future only gradually (as the instances show) can hardly be explained otherwise than by postulating the deep-rooted character of the first person future personal ending-an in Mal.

There is also evidence of a gradual evolution of the absence of personal endings in literary tradition. The contrast between the types of personal endings used in KG on the one hand and those of Eḻ on the other, for instance, would indicate this

evolution in literary tradition. The gradualness of the evolution points to the fact that personal endings may not have been exotic in Mal.

3. PRESENT TENSE.

1. The characteristic Mal. present tense ending is-un'n' - < - und'- < ind'- < an ending like -g-ind'-of Middle Tamil. I have discussed these stages in detail in my HAP; I shall briefly summarise the facts below:—

(i) -g-inṛ- [appearing in Old Tamil texts in the past tense "neuter" forms like ā-g-inṛu [ā-g + in + d (u)] appears to have been first employed during the Middle Tam. period in the texts [i. e. from about the fourth or the fifth century A. D.] as a present tense ending to which personal terminations were annexed. That the original past tense value of āginṛu was forgotten is clear from the fact that this form is employed with a present tense force in some Old Tamil texts like Aiṅguṛunūṛu and Paripāḍal. In the writings of the Śaivites and the Vaiṣṇavites during the early Middle Tamil period, gind'-or ginṛ-appears profusely as a present tense ending followed by personal terminations. [cf. V. Kriyā., 3].

(ii) In early west coast inscriptions, forms with the present tense affix-ind'- [without the -g-of Tam. -g-ind'-] appear, as in ceyyind'a [TAS, II, p. 191 (10th c.) and VII, p. 25 (12th c.)], aruḷind'- [TAS, VII, p. 117], koḷḷind'avar [TAS, VII, p. 66].

(iii) This-ind'-of the west coast inscriptions and of some of the earlier texts normally changes [according to a rule[1] of Mal. Phonology], to in'n'-and-un'n'-, as attested by inscriptional instances like the following:—

വച്ചിരിക്കുന്നടിന്നു vaccirikkun'n'adinnu [TAS, V, p. 62—11th c.].

വരുന്ന varun'n'a [ib., IV, p. 86]—13th c.

വണ്ണരുളുന്ന vaṇṇaruḷun'n'a [ib.]—13th c.

മീളിന്നൊറ്റു mīḷin'n'-[TAS, VII, p. 92].

1. The change of-i-of -in'n'u- to-u-is due to its unaccented position. For a similarly caused change, cf. ponninkudam and ponnuṅgudam; vādilkkal and vādukkaḷ.

2. The following present tense forms [with the ending ā-n'in'n'-or-āy-n'in'n'-] occurring in some very old west coast inscriptions and also in KR correspond to the Middle Tam. present tense ending -ā-n'in'd- mentioned in N, 143—

വളരായ്നിന്ന valarāyn'in'n'a [KR, Bāl, 48].

valarān'in'n'a [KR, Ār, 56].

ചെല്ലാനിന്ന cellān'in'n'a [BhG, 13, 15].

നടവാനില്ക n'aḍavān'ilka [KR, Sund., 45].

This present tense ending never struck deep root in Mal. Līl. explicitly points it out [I, 1, comm.] as a Tamil ending.

4. PAST TENSE

The formation of the past stem with-t-[and its sandhi modifications] or-with- i- is guided in Mal. by the same rules as in Tamil [cf. my MOTV]; but the following peculiarities in Mal. deserve notice.

1. The palatalisation of-tt-> -cc, nd> ñj> ññ, and the change of nd' and n'd to n'n' form features of Mal. phonology, the chronology of which I have referred to in my GL.

2. The sandhi change of original-ḷnd-to-ṇṇ-> -ṇ-,as in the following, is another special Mal. development:—താണ്ണ് tāṇṇ-[<*tāṇḍu <tāḷ-nd-, the past stem of tāḷ] or tāṇ- [US, II, 69], beside താന്ന് tān'n'- [VR, p. 263]; ഈണ്ണ് īṇṇ- [RC, 40]; വീണ്ണ് vīṇṇ- [KR, Ār., 126] beside the more modern വീണ് vīṇ- [US]; ഉമിണ്ണ് umiṇṇ- [KR, Ār., 77] beside ഉമിഞ്ഞു umiññu [Rām. camp.]; പുകണ്ണ് pugaṇṇ- [Rām. camp.] beside pugaḷn'n'- [Eḻ Bh]; മകിണ്ണ് magiṇṇ- [Rām. camp. Aṅg] beside magiḷn'n'- [Eḻ Bh]; കമിണ്ണ് kamiṇṇ- [Rām. camp.] beside kamaḷn'n'- ; വാണ്ണരുളുന്ന vāṇṇ-aruḷun'n'a [TAS, IV, p. 86] beside വാണ്ട് vāṇḍ- [TAS, IV, p. 19 (12th c.]; n'ūṇ-[< n'ūḷnd] [Rām. camp.]; ആണ്ണ് āṇṇ-[Līl., cit., 1, 3] beside ān'n'-; അമിണ്ണ് amiṇṇ- [ib.]; കേണ്ണ് kēṇṇ-[KBhāg.] beside kēṇ-.

In modern speech, vīṇ-, vāṇ-, tāṇ- [with reduction of ṇṇ to ṇ] are heard. In some areas tān'n'- instead of tāṇ-; cūn'n'- instead of cūṇ- also exist.

---

1 cf. ചൂന്ന് cūn'n'u [RC, 763]; മൂപ്പുവാനെ muppu vān'n'ē in an early 17th c. document [KSP, I, p. 26].

3. The older past stems of cār-[1] and kudaṛ- were respecively cāṛn'n'- [VR] and kudaṛn'n'-[Eḷ Bh], while cāri- and kudaṛi- appear to be common today.

Regional variations in past stems also appear to exist. pūṇḍ- of North Mal. corresponds to pūḷi of the south, both meaning 'having cut open into slices'. mūḷ- 'to hum in approval' has both mūḷ-i- and mūṇḍ- as its past stems.

vīy 'to blow, as the wind' has in Malayāḷam two past stems, both used in Old Mal. texts : vīd- and vīyi-; but the alternative vīś- (which alone is used today) has always had vīṣi- for its past stem.

īr- 'to split' has īṛn'n'- and īri- for its past stems; the variation appears to be regional. mudirn'n'-and mudirtt- are both used in the texts as the past stem of mudir- ; in modern Mal. mudirn'n'- is common.

4. coll- has the past stem coll-i-, on which are based tense-forms like collinēn > connēn, or colli-y-ēn [Bh Bh]; but the existence of forms like connān, connēn has led to the use of connu also without the personal ending, as in KG [e. g., Kamsam., l. 168.]

The past stem was also confused as cond'- [cf. cond'āl in US, II, 14], just as the past stem van'n' [< vand-] was often in old texts written wrongly as vand'-. In the citations of L, I find പിറന്റാൻ piṛand'ān [2, 11, comm.], തന്റ് tand'- [for tan'n'-], തുറന്റ് tuṛand' [for tuṛan'n'-] in L, 4, 7 cit.

5. എഴുനിൽക്ക eḻun'ilkk is a very ancient Mal. compound verb base expressing the indispensable idea of 'standing up from a sitting to a rising posture'. The past stem of this compounded base appears normally as eḻun'in'n'- in several contexts in the works of the Niraṇam Paṇikkars [e. g. in KR, Ār.] and occurs in the 17th c. Kirāt., Kiḷipp. 4, l. 72.

But the more modern eḻun'ēṯṯ'- also appears in US, KG and other works. Apparently, the compound nature of the base had been lost sight of, the base itself was written as eḻun'ēlk-, and

---

1 cf. ചാൎന്നവൎക്ക ചാരിയെഴുതിയാലും മതി cāṛn'n'avaṛkku cāri-y-eḻudiyālum madi [KU, p. 37].

[on the analogy perhaps of the past stem ēṯṯ-of ēl-kk-] the new stem eḻun'ēṯṯ- came to be used.

Colloquially, the base has undergone further alterations. By the sandhi of ḻ+n=ṇ [cf. tāṇ-< tāḻnd-], the base has assumed the form eṇīkk- [cf എണീപ്പിച്ചു eṇīppiccu Bh Bh, 2, p. 88] and എണീററോടി eṇīṯṯ-ōḍi [ib., 2, p. 90], with its past stem as eṇīṯṯ-, which is sometimes still further contracted to ēṯṯ] [Nāg. 2, 25].

5. Bh Bh uses past tense forms like മടങ്ങിയാൻ madaṅṅiyān, ചൊല്ലിയാൻ colliyān, അടങ്ങിയാൻ adaṅṅiyān, as if formed directly from relative participles of the type having -iya. Tam. does not usually show such finites, for which aḍaṅginān, etc. [with-in-] would ordinarily be used, the aḍaṅgiyān type being regarded in Tamil as a participial noun; but pōyān, pōyār, āyān, āyār occur in Tamil and in early Mal. Maḍaṅṅiyān, etc. were perhaps formed on the analogy of pōyān, āyān, common in early Mal.

Eḻ uses occasionally forms like മുടക്കിയേൻ muḍakkiyēn [Rām., p. 60], muḍakkiyāḷ [ib., p. 61].

The "archaic" form പോയിനേൻ pōyinēn occurs in KG, Rugm, l. 71; but this is perhaps unique.

5. THE FUTURE TENSE

Two types exist in Mal:—1. the-um type denoting future and "aoristic"[1] tense-significations ; 2. the older type with-v-, -m [Tam.-b-, after nasals of bases], -pp-, which type appears with personal endings.

The-um type

1. In Tamil, the tense with- um appears only in connection with the third person singular "rational" [masculine and feminine] and third personal "irrational" singular and plural.

TC, 227 and N, 348 expressly prohibit the use of this tense in connection with the first person, the second person and the third person "rational" plural.

The sūtra of TC deserves to be cited: pallōr paḍarkkai munnilai tanmai-y-avvayin mūnṟum n'igaḻun-gālattu-c-ceyyum-enṟum kiḷaviyoḍu koḷḷā.

---

1. I use the term "aorist" in its literal sense viz "indeterminate" or "undefined".

An important point to be noted from this particular sūtra is that the tense with -um is regarded as having the force of n'igaḷ kālam 'present tense'.

But this tense-signification does not appear to be exclusive according to Tolkāppiyam col.; for, sutra 240 envisages an "aoristic" or "indeterminate" signification also: munnilai kālamum tōnṛum iyaṛkai-y-emmuṛai-c-collu[m] nigaḻuṅ-gālattu meyn'n'ilai-p-podu-c-col kiḷattal vēṇḍum. The sūtra refers to actions which are true of the past, present and future, as in ñāyir-iyaṅgum, etc. [cf. Mal. paśu pullu tinnum].

In Middle Tamil the restriction of the use of the -um tense to the third person "rational" singular and to the third person "irrational" singular and plural continues [N, 348]; but the tense is described in N, 145 as denoting the "present" and "future" meanings [nigaḻpu and edirvu].

In the colloquial Tamil of today, the-um tense appears only (i) after "irrational" subjects [both singular and plural] and (ii) with "future" as well as indeterminate "eternal present" meanings.

The Old Tam. grammar TC thus envisages this tense as "present" and "aoristic", while Nannūl regards it as having "present" and "future" meanings; and in the colloquial today this type has "future" and "aoristic" values.

The primary signification was perhaps "aoristic" with a bias for the "present-future" values. Not only the Tamil type but the Telugu counterpart ceyun (which, be it noted here, is exactly as in Tam. used only for singular masculines and feminines and singular and plural "irrationals") has also "aoristic" values which may be interpreted according to the context as present, future or (rarely) past [see Āndhraśabdānuśāsana, II, p. 119]. The Kannaḍa counterpart with-g-um is also "aoristic" though used for all third personal forms [Kittel's Gr., p. 146].

I cannot for my part agree with the view that because TC describes it as a "present" tense, its primary signification was exclusively "present". In the first place TC itself envisages an "aoristic" value. Secondly, a "present" tense of this kind

could not have been limited to a few third personal forms. Thirdly, the evidence of the usage of the Telugu and Kannaḍa counterparts is definite in pointing to "aoristic" values. Nor could this type have been exclusively "future', in view of the existence of a regular future type (with v, b, pp) in Tamil.

Everything therefore points to the conclusion that the -um tense was originally employed as an "aoristic" action-type with a "present-future" bias. Instances with -um in Ṣaṅgam texts like Puṛanānūṛu and Naṭṭiṇai have "indeterminate" values. On an examination of Puṛanānūṛu, for instance, I find that the -um type is commonly used as an aorist, though this may include a present tense force [cf. ceyyum-i-v- vigalē in 45; ṅel viḷaiyum, paḷam ūḷkkum, vaḷḷi-k- kiḷaṅgu vīḷkkum in Verse 109]. Instances from Kalittogai (another Śaṅgam work) like el-vaḷai iṛai-y-ūrummē [I, 7, 16], though capable of being translated into the present or the future meanings, appear to be fundamentally "indeterminate" in tense- idea with a bias for the present or future meanings.

If it is asked why the use of this "aoristic" tense was restricted to the third person, I should answer that perhaps there were far more contexts in which the third person was associated with "eternal" or "habitual" actions than those connected with the first and the second persons.

Since Tam. had a regular future tense with -v-, -b-, -pp-, the "future" value ascribed to the -um type by the Nannūl Sūtra might have been isolated in Tamil from the "aoristic" type. Such a future value exists (besides other values) for Telugu ceyyun type. The Kannaḍa tense with -g-um allied to the type under reference, however, always had the aoristic value, and -g-um was employed in Kannaḍa for all third persons [as a development from the stage denoted by that of Tam. and Telugu, where it was restricted to certain forms of the third person, as pointed out above].

Coming to Mal., I note the following features:—

1. In the earliest texts, this tense appears only after the third person sing. and plural "rationals" and after the third

person singular and plural "irrationals", the only difference between early Old Mal. and Tam. being that Mal. shows -um after third personal rational plurals also. The other "persons" are not generally associated with the -um tense in US, RC, KR, KBhr, Bh G.

ഇവരാദികളും എന്നെഅറിയും ivar enne aṛiyum [KBhr, p. 116] where the -um finite is used for pallōr paḍarkkai [=third pers. rational pl.] for which it is prohibited expressly in Tamil.

കരക്കപടയും കൊടിയമന്നവരും മുടിയും paḍayum mannavarum muḍiyum [RC, 63]; mēvin'n'avar vīḻum [Bh G, 4, 9]; ഇന്നരിച്ചവർകളും അവനിയിൽവന്നുപിറക്കും van'n'upiṛakkum [BhG, 8, 9].

By about the fifteenth century, the texts show the-um tense in connection with the first and the second persons. KG· and the early campus have instances:—

നല്കും നീ n'algum n'ī [K G, Rājas., l. 83]
നിങ്ങൾകൂടും n'iṅṅaḷ kūḍum [K G, Kṛṣṇ., l. 578]
തങ്ങളും നീയും നശിച്ചുപോമേ taṅṅaḷum n'īyum n'aśiccu pōmē [KG, Rājas., l.302]
ഞങ്ങൾ മറക്കും ñaṅṅaḷ maṛakkum [ib., Vals., l. 562]
അടങ്ങുമോ നാം aḍaṅṅumō n'ām [Rām. camp., Sugr, 16]
നാം ഇരുവരുമേ ചേരും n'ām iruvarumē cērum [ib., Rāv.]
നീയായ്‌വരുംനീ nī-y-ā varum n'ī [Rām. camp., Paṭṭ., 95]

The extension of-um to the first and the second persons, judged from the evidence of the texts, was certainly gradual; but, as the above instances show, there can be little doubt that the extension of -um to persons other than the third one in Mal. colloquial may by this time have been more or less advanced, and though the older literary tradition continued to be respected [even by Eḻ and by other writers of the New Mal. period], as in the use of ñān taruvan [instead of ñān tarum], the charactersti c Mal. practice of using-um in connection with all "persons' might have been more or less completely developed in the living speech by the fifteenth century.

This use became gradually more and more popular in the texts. In the present-day colloquial, forms like ñān tarum, avan varum, n'ī varum are exclusively used.

2. The second important feature of Mal. is that from the earliest texts down till today, the significations attached to this tense are the "aoristic" and the "future" ones. This may be compared to what is envisaged by Nannūl for Middle Tam.

While, however, Middle Tam. more commonly used the future with- v-, etc. (followed by personal endings) for the third personal "rationals", the earliest texts of Mal., employ-um for these "rationals" (sing and pl.) in order to convey the "future" idea. In fact -um had become in Mal. by about the beginning of the literary era a common future ending in connection with all third personal forms. Gradually, it became indispensable for other persons also; and today the "future" type in Mal. is with the -um ending, though the "aoristic" signification also may in some contexts be conveyed by this tense.

The following points emerge from this discussion:—

(a) The use of - um in the earliest Mal. texts corresponds, generally speaking, to that of Middle Tamil, except for the fact that the - um type as a future had become very common in third person sing. and pl. "rationals" in Mal., while in Middle Tam. it was used in connection only with singulars among the "rationals", and here too only as an "indeterminate" tense.

(b) The gradual extension of -um to all persons in Mal. came to be mirrored in the texts from about the 15th century.

(c) New Mal. definitely fixed the -um tense to denote the "future" and the aoristic significations, while modern Tamil has gone its own way in retaining the future -v-, -b, -pp- for all persons except the third person "irrationals."

The future with v, m, pp, followed by personal endings.

The future forms with v, m [Tam. b] and pp, followed by personal endings, occur in Old Mal.texts. Līl. expressly refers to them, RC and the Panikkars use them freely, and they are not unrepresented in KG; but by the time of Eḻ they have disappeared from the texts, except in the first person sing. with the personal ending-an,—a dominant type in Mal. which is very frequently used by Eḻ and which is also met with in many folk-songs.

6. THE AORISTIC TENSE WITH ū

This is a unique tense-type in Mal., not unrepresented in the earliest inscriptions. Both Gundert and Kēraḷa Pāṇini regarded this type as a "future" tense; but, as will be seen below, it has to be considered as fundamentally an "aoristic" type in view of its meanings and applications (though its aoristic force may in some contexts be interpreted as "future").

നൂറുനാഴി നെൽ തിരുപ്പുകൈക്കൊള്ളോ uḷḷō [TAS, II, p. 184—9th or 10th c.]

[That this uḷḷō is equivalent in meaning to oḷḷidu=uḷḷadu is clear from നൂറുകലമും തിരുച്ചന്ദനത്തിനൊള്ളിതു oḷḷidu in TAS, II, p. 184]

അതിനിൽപൊലികൊണ്ടവെ ഇരുപതൈന്തുപറൈ koḷvō [TAS, II, p. 186—9th or 10th c.]

ഒള്ളോ oḷḷō [TAS, IV, p. 46—12th c.]

ഇരുനാഴി അരികൊടുപ്പൂ koḍuppū [TAS, VII, p. 66—13th c.]

[The same inscription has koḍuppadu with the same "hortative" meaning].

ഊട്ടുവൂ ūṭṭuvū [TAS, III, p. 209—13th c.]

(a) Structure of the tense with-ū. After -y, -l, -ḷ and ḻ, of bases the u is preceded by-v; by m after final nasals of bases; and by -pp- after kārita bases with -kk-:- ceyvū, koḷvū, kāṇmū, koḍuppū, inscrip- tional ūṭṭuvū etc. Except the ppū type, the others appear without v and m also, as in koḷḷū, ceyyū, kāṇū. Obviously, koḷḷū, ceyyū, etc. may have been "reductions" of koḷvū, ceyvū, etc. [cf. koḷḷān from koḷvān; ceyyin < ceyvin; kāṇān < kāṇmān].

Structurally, the forms have v, m and pp, like the forms of the future formed as in Tamil (except for the m of Mal. which answers to -b-, after nasals, of Tamil).

(b) The significations of the type are the following:—

(i) a purely "indeterminate" meaning:—

എങ്ങനെ മനസിപൊറുപ്പൂ poṟuppū [K Bhāg., p. 205]

എങ്ങനെ രോഗം ഇളപ്പൂ iḷappū [ib., p. 262]

എന്തുള്ളൂഫലം uḷḷū [KR, Utt., 96]

ശാസിപ്പു എന്നതും താഡിപ്പു എന്നതും śāsippu....tāḍippu [KG, Ulūkh., l. 579 and l. 580]

The following also show ു: —

എഞ്ഞു eññū [Eḷ Bh]
അല്ലു allū [Rām. camp., Sītāpari·, 72]
ചാരത്തു cārattū [KG, Rājas., l. 224]
എവിടത്തു eviḍattū [Nāgān., 2, 104]

By analogy, ū appears in the following:—

കയ്യിലു kayyilū [KG, Kucēl., l. 84]
ഉള്ളിലു uḷḷilū [ib,] Vals., l. 569
വലിയു valiyū [Bharatavāky., 65]

(ii) "Aoristic":—"eternal" actions:—

തങ്കലിക്കാദുഃഖത്തെ തങ്കൽ വീഴു vīḻū]Rām. camp., Vicch., gadya]
പാററ ഉണ്ടല്ലി വിളക്കത്തു വിണുചാവു cāvū [Bh Bh, 1, p 44]
സജ്ജനങ്ങളെക്കൊണ്ടെ ഉജ്ജ്വലം സന്തോഷിപ്പു santōṣippū [Eḷ Bh]

(iii) "Aoristic":—Habit,[1] custom, or actions extending for a period of time:—

ചിലർ പശുക്കിടാവാവു, ചിലർ കാളയാവു, ചിലർ പുടവമൂടിക്കളിപ്പു, ചിലർ പക്ഷികളെപ്പോലെ കരവു cilar paśukkiḍāv-āvū, cilar kāḷa-y-āvū, cilar puḍava mūḍi-k-kaḷippū, cilar pakṣigaḷe-p-pōle karavū [BhBh, 1, p. 42].

മുന്നം ഞാൻ കേട്ടിരിപ്പു keṭṭirippū [Eḷ Rām, p. 22].

(iv) In "conditional" constructions containing a restrictive condition denoted by a preceding form with the restrictive particle ē:—

ഇല്ലയെങ്കിലോ വരാവൊന്നുള്ളു [RC, 745].
ഉണ്ടാമേ മതിയാവു madi-y-āvū [K Bhāg., p. 47].
സേവിക്കേ വേണ്ടു sēvikkē vēṇḍū [K Bhāg., p. 255].
ഭവാൻ ഒരുത്തനേ ശേഷിപ്പു bhavān oruttanē śēṣippū [BhBh, 1, 12].
കൊന്നു മുടിക്കിലേ കോപം തീരു kon'n'u muḍikkilē kōpam tīrū [KG]
നിന്നുടെ കാരുണ്യം എന്നേ ആവു n'innuḍe kāruṇyam en'n'ē-y-āvū [KG]

---

1 On p. 74 of BhBh, Vol. 1, കരയുക karayuga as a verbal noun with the force of an aorist is equated in meaning to കരവു, in the following sentence-sequence: പക്ഷികളെപ്പോലെ കരയുക; അവള കരവു.

(v) As imperatives:—

നിങ്ങൾ കേൾപ്പു kēḷppū [US, 1, 36], ചാരത്തു കാണുന്ന ദാരിക തന്നെയും........കൊണ്ടിങ്ങുപോന്നു കൊൾവു koḷvū [KG, Kṛṣṇ., l. 582], എൻ പിഴ നീ പൊറുപ്പു poṛuppū [KG, Vals., l. 1551].

നിങ്ങൾ അടുത്തു കൊൾവു koḷvū [KG, Kamsam., l 190.].

നീ കണ്ടു ചൊൽവു colvū [i.b, l. 222].

പോരിട്ടുകൊള്ളു നാം koḷḷū [KG, Ulūkh., l. 118].

നീ നിൽപ്പു, കളിപ്പു, കാണ്മു n'ilpū, kaḷippū, kāṇmū [Rām. camp., Sitāsway , 104 ff.]

(vi) "Aoristic", with a bias for the "future":—

എന്തുകൊണ്ടു തോല്പിപ്പു ഞാൻ tōlpippū [=tōlpippadu; KG. Ulūkh., l. 740].

ഇങ്ങനെ ഞാൻ ചെയ്‌വു ceyvū [BhBh, 1, p. 5].

(c) In present-day Malayāḷam, the following syntactic functions alone exist for this type:—

(i) The form is most commonly and frequently used along with a restrictive word or phrase preceding it, the "restriction" being denoted by the particle ē attached to the form expressing the idea so restricted:—

അവനേ വരൂ avanē varū
നാളയേ വായിക്കൂ nāḷayē vāyikkū
അനുഭവിച്ചേ അറിയൂ anubhaviccē aṛiyū
ഇതേ മതിയാവൂ idē madi-y-āvū
ആറുപേരേ വന്നിട്ടുള്ളൂ āṛupēre van'n'iṭṭ-uḷḷū
അനുജനേ വരികയുള്ളൂ anujanē variga-y-uḷḷū

(ii) As an "aorist" it appears in questions implying gentle "doubt":—

എന്തുവേണ്ടൂ endu vēṇḍū
എന്തുള്ളൂ end-uḷḷū [more common in Travancore]

(iii) In modern poetic compositions, the forms are used with an "aoristic" signification which sometimes amounts to a lasting present tense:—

ചന്ദനാലേപം ചാർത്തിജ്ജ്വലിപ്പൂ ഹരിമുഖം śōbhippū [Vaḷḷattōḷ's Bhaktiyum Vibhaktiyum]. This usage is, however, limited to poetry.

The probable origin of this tense.

The suggestion that the -ū of this tense-type may have been a reduced form of -um is, I think, untenable for three reasons:—(a) the structure of forms like koḷvū, ceyvū, koḍuppū, ūṭṭuvū [inscriptional], kāṇmu definitely rules out the possibility of any straight connection with -um; for, -um is never associated with -v-, -pp or -m-; (b) -um was employed originally and primarily in connection with third personal forms alone, while the -ū tense has been associated from a very early period with all persons; (c) many of the syntactic functions of the ū tense cannot be conveyed by the -um tense.

The explanation of the origin of the ū- tense has to be sought in a different direction altogether.

(a) Now it is a remarkable fact that the "neuter" participial nouns of the type of ceyvadu with its variants ceyvidu and ceyvūdu would express the chief syntactic significations conveyed by the ū tense:—

"Aoristic" bhāvavacana or verbal noun—

1. Ceyvadu type—

എന്നേ പറവതു് paṟavadu [Kalyāṇ., 11]

ആർ പോവതു് pōvadu [RC].

പറവതു കേട്ടടനേ paṟavadu [KR, Ar., 225].

കാപ്പതു ഞാൻ kāppadu [BhG, 10, 14].

2. Ceyvidu type—

ചൊല്ലുവിതും ചെയ്യാൻ colluvidum [Bh Bh, I, p. 6]

ഞാൻ നടത്തുവിതു n'aḍattuvidu [RC, 638].

3. Ceyvūdu type—

എങ്ങു നോക്കാവൂതു n'ōkkāvūdu [US, I, 9].

എങ്ങനെ ഞങ്ങൾ പൊറുപ്പൂതു് poṟuppūdu [KG, Gōp., l. 685].

അലയുവൂതുമുണ്ടു് alayuvūdum [Bh Bh, 2, p. 18].

"Imperative"—

കൊൾവതു് koḷvadu [TAS, II, p. 174—10th c.].

രാമൻ ചിരം കളവതു് kaḷavadu [RC, 65].

ഒടുക്കുവിതു oḍukkuvidu [TAS, II, p. 173—10th c.].

ഒഴിവിതു oḻividu [TAS, III, p. 32—12th c.].

നീ പോവിതു വടക്കു നോക്കി pōvidu [RC, 532]

നീ കുറിക്കൊൾവൂതു kuṟi-k-koḷvūdu [US, 2, 97].

കളവൂതു kaḷavūdu [RC, 347].

Forms like koḍuppūdum, irippūdum, ōḍūdum, etc., used in BhBh and other texts, have a verbal noun force.

4. Ceyvū type—

ശാസിപ്പൂ എന്നതു് śāsippū — For instances, see above.
[KG, Ulūkh., l. 579]

താഡിപ്പൂ എന്നതു് tāḍippū
[ib., l. 580]

എങ്ങനെ പുലൻ
കൊൾവൂ kolvū [ib., l. 486]

These types are thus intimately inter-related in respect of their primary syntactic functions.

(b) Now, the neuter participial noun of the ceyvadu type is employed in Tamil both as a pure participial and as a gentle "imperative" (though the latter is a colloquial feature, generally speaking). In Kannaḍa, express literary recognition has been given to the verbal noun signification and to the imperative meaning [in the second and third persons, sing. and plural] for the geyvadu type [Kittel's Gr., p. 149]. The use of this type therefore, as a bhāvavacana and as an imperative is common to Tam., Kannaḍa and Mal.

The structural variant, with final -idu, of ceyvadu has been recorded as existing in Tam. (perhaps in the colloquial, reflected in the inscriptions of the Early Middle Tam. period) by Perundēvanār, the 11th or 12th century commentator of Vīracōḻiyam.

On the other hand, grammatical and literary recognition has been accorded in Kannaḍa to forms like geyvudu in the ancient and medieval dialects of Kannaḍa.

Thus one notes that while Tam. had ceyvadu and ceyvidu and Kannaḍa had geyvadu and geyvudu, Mal. had ceyvadu, ceyvidu and ceyvūdu.

These facts lead me to think that structurally these "neuter" participials with -idu and-udu (ūdu) are variants of those having -adu. Gundert [Gr., p. 74] considers -idu and -udu as respectively the proximate and intermediate demonstratives; and Kannaḍa grammarians also postulate -udu of old geyvudu as standing for the intermediate demonstrative.

So far as Mal. forms with -udu or -ūdu are concerned, it is doubtful whether one can assuredly say that -udu stands for the

intermediate demonstrative. This demonstrative which (be it said here) is of rare occurrence in Tamil and Kannaḍa (as an independent form) does not exist independently in Mal. at all. The participials with -idu may (in the absence of any evidence to connect them directly with the proximate and intermediate demonstratives) very well be viewed as phonetic variants of the participials with -adu. Lack of stress could account for -idu, while -udu and ūdu may easily have arisen from -uvadu of forms like ōḍuvadu [> ōḍūdu], iṛaññu-vadu [> iṛaññūdu].

(c) Be this as it may, it is with neuter participials of the type of ചെയ്‌വൂതു ceyvūdu, ഓടൂതു ōḍūdu and കൊടുപ്പൂതു koḍuppūdu, that the aoristic ceyvū, ōḍū and koḍuppū of Mal. have to be connected. Functionally and structurally, the ū tense is intimately related to the ceyvadu, koḍuppadu type and its variants.

From forms like ചെൽവൂതു celvūdu, കൊടുപ്പൂതു koḍuppūdu, the finals might have been dropped, and aoristic and imperative types like celvū, koḍuppū may have been formed. Similarly, uḷḷūdu, eññūdu, n'allūdu (participials with ū analogically introduced) would yield uḷḷū, eññū and n'allū. I have not come across instances like allūdu (for alladu) and eviḍattūdu (for eviḍattadu); the formation of allū (occurring in the campus) and of eviḍattū may have been due to analogy. kayyilū (of KG) n'iṅgaḷū (of Eḷ), വരേൺമു varēṇmū [Rām. camp., Vicch., gadya] ഓർക്കേൺമു ōṛkkēṇmū [ib., Udyān., 75] [these two latter forms are contractions of വരേണ്ടു and ഓർക്കേണ്ടു] also owe their ū perhaps to analogy.

The structural -v-, -m and -pp-, and the "aoristic" basis of the semantic ramifications in the different contexts in which these forms are used, make it probable that the final forms with -ū (sometimes also appearing as short u) arose from the truncation of participials like ōḍūdu, koḍuppūdu, celvūdu, the process of truncation perhaps having been facilitated by the disintegration of personal endings in Mal.[1]

---

1 In the process of the popularisation of this ഊതു- type, perhaps instances like പൂജിയ്ക്കുവൂതു [TAS, II, p. 176] and ചെലവുവൂതു [TAS, III, p. 187] may have also exercised some influence.

7. INFINITIVE PARTICIPLES.

The history of the infinitive participles in Mal. forms one of the most important chapters of the evolution of Mal. morphology.

The Śaṅgam texts of Old Tamil had only the type with final -a [which appeared as -pp-a in connection with kārita verb-bases having -kk]; and this type expressed "simultanaeity" of action, "sequentiality" and "result" [see my MOTV]. In Middle Tamil however, this type also expressed sometimes the signification of "purpose"; but side by the side with this, a new type with -vān-, bān, -ppān also cropped up in Middle Tamil [V, Dhātu., 8] to denote purpose.

Early Old Mal. employed both the types, the former for expressing "effect", "simultaneity" and rarely "sequentiality" and "purpose"; and the latter exclusively for denoting "purpose"; gradually, however, the former type began to be displaced in Mal. by other syntactic constructions, and (along with this) the latter was also extended in usage and in syntactic force. To-day, while in Tam. the -vān type exists in the colloquial only in collocations like colluvān ēn, it is most active in Mal. colloquial (and literary dialect) in numerous contexts (see below); conversely, while the older type with -a is commonly employed in the modern Tamil colloquial with the significations of "purpose" and rarely of "effect" and "simultaneity", it has practically disappeared as an active infinitive participle from modern Mal., its existence being traceable only in some syntactic constructions, in a number of words with an "adverbial", "adjectival" or "postpositional" force, and in a few old proverbs and phrases.

The -a type in early Mal.

(i) With almost the force of a verbal noun:—

ചൊല്ലത്തുടങ്ങിനാൻ colla-t-tuḍaṅginān]RC, 56]
ചൊല്ലക്കേട്ട്" colla-k-kēṭṭu [RC, 128]
പോകത്തുടങ്ങിനാർ pōga-t-tuḍaṅṅinār [KG, Kṛṣṇ., l. 465].

The more modern constructions പറയുവാൻ തുടങ്ങി parayuvān tuḍaṅṅi for the first illustration above, and parayun'n'adu kēṭṭu for the second one above, are also not unrepresente d in these early texts.

(ii) "Simultaneity"—

ഇവ(ർ)കൾ ഇരിക്കക്കൈയ്യെഴുതി iva(r)gaḷ irikka-k-kayyeḻudi [TAS, III, p. 172].

വര വര വടക്ക് അടുത്താർ vara vara vaḍakk- aḍuttār [RC, 140].

വാനവർകാണമറഞ്ഞു vānavar kāṇa maṟaññu [KR, Bāl., 84].

കാണക്കാണ നടന്നു kāṇa-k-kāṇa n'aḍan'n'u [Rājarat.]

വീഴ വീഴ, പൊന്നപ്പൊന്ന vīḻa vīḻa, poṅṅa-p-poṅṅa [KG, Vṛkṣas., l. 88 and l. 92].

(iii) "Sequentiality"—

മാരുതി പൂവാൻ ചെല്ല..ലങ്കാ ചെരുത്തുര ചെയ്താൾ mārudi pūvān cella.. lanka ceṛutt-ura ceydāḷ [KR, Sund., 31].

അവൾ ഉര ചെയ്യ,..ചൊന്നാൻ ദശമുഖനും avaḷ ura ceyya,..connān daśamukhanum [KR, Ār.].

വായുതനുജൻ നേർവലി ചെല്ല..മെയ്തടവീടിനാൻ വായുദേവൻ vāyu tanujan nēr vaḷi cella ...mey taḍavīḍinān vāyu dēvan [KR, Sund., 9].

(iv) "Effect"—

ചതികെട അമർചെയ്തു cadi keḍa amar ceydu [KR, Bāl., 85].

കുറവ് അറ മറന്നു kuṟav-aṟa maṟan'n'u [US, II, 24].

ആണയ aṇaya [US, I 50].

കൂട്ടമാ ഇരിന്നു kūṭṭam-ā irin'n'u [TAS, IV, p. 46]; [ā = āga].

നിവിരത്തൊഴുതു nivira-t-toḻudu.

കുളുർക്ക നോക്കി kuḷurkka n'ōkki [BhBh, I, p. 48].

വിരിഞ്ചൻ നടുങ്ങേ, പ്രപഞ്ചം കുലുങ്ങേ, ദിനേശൻ മയങ്ങേ viriñjan n'aḍuṅṅē, prapañjam kuluṅṅē, dinēśan mayaṅṅē [Kaly., gadya 5].

(v) "Purpose"—

അടൽ തടുക്കവന്നപോതു aḍal taḍukka van'n'a pōdu [RC, 449].

പൊയ്ക്കൊള്ള വേണ്ടി poy-k-koḷḷa vēṇḍi [RC, 44]. This is rather rare. The more common construction is with the vān-type.

Except in the contexts mentioned below, this type of old Inf. Participle is not current in New Mal. [1] The type persisted,

1 El uses old collocations like വിരവൊടെഴുന്നേറ്റയ് [Bh, p. 275], വില്ലു കുഴിയെക്കലച്ചു [Bh], ഒരുത്തർ കേൾക്കപ്പറഞ്ഞീടൊലാ [Bh. p. 305]. See Ch. VII. for further instances.

at least as a tradition-sanctioned construction, [1] down till the 17th and 18th centuries, particularly with the syntactic signification of "simultaneity". Forms like irikkavē, n'ōkkavē, etc., are used in literature even to-day.

The a type in modern Malayalam.

(i) In proverbs and in old phrases :—

എല്ലുമുറിയെപ്പണിതാൽ പല്ലുമുറിയെത്തിന്നാം ellu muṛiye ...pallu muṛiye [MP, No. 212].

ഇരുന്നും തൊഴിലും ഇരിക്കെക്കെടും irikke-k-keḍum [MP, No. 135].

ഇരിക്കപ്പൊറുതി irikka-p-poṛudi

ഇരിക്കക്കട്ടിൽ irikka-k-kaṭṭil.

(ii) "Adverbial":—

കൂടക്കൂടെ kūḍa-k-kūḍe [2]
തോരത്തോരെ tōra-t-tōre
ഏറെ ēṛe
പോലെ pōle
വളരെ vaḷare
ഉയരെ uyare
ആകെ āge
മുമ്പാകെ mumbāge
നീളെ nīḷe
പെരികെ perige
തിരിയെ tiriye
പരക്കെ parakke
തീരെ tīre
പടുക്കെ padukke
കുറെ kuṛe [< കുറയ kuṛa-ya; cf. കുറയപ്പാകിൽ in Girij., p. 28; കുറയപ്പാർക്ക kuṛaya-p-pāṛk-ka, ib. p. 54; കുറയക്കണ്ടല്ല kuṛaya-k-kaṇ-ḍalla in El Bh].

ഒക്കെ okke, the infinitive participle of okk-'to be joined', has become an almost indispensable word in Mal. Arising as an infinitive participle [cf. Tam. okka 'joined together' 'in unison', etc.], in certain contexts it has become almost a noun in New Mal. with the force of 'whole', standing in appositional relationship to the noun-idea governed by it.

In these contexts it is also sometimes declined:—

ഒക്കെയ്ക്കും okkaikkum [El Cint., p. 27]; ഈ ലോകം ഒക്കെയ്ക്കും ī lōgam okkaikkum [VR, p. 28]; ഒക്കെയ്ക്കും യജമാനൻ okkaikkum

1 VR has some older types like പിച്ചിപ്പൂ വിരിയക്കണ്ടും [p. 232], വരക്കണ്ട് [p .262], മുനിമാർ കേൾക്കച്ചൊല്ലിലും [p. 264].

2 El uses echo-phrases like ഉടനുടപ്പൊടിച്ചു, ചടുചടത്തിളച്ചു, കടുകടക്കടിച്ചു [Bh., p. 343].

yajamānan [Tuḷḷ., p. 248]; ഒക്കയിലും നല്ലദു okkayilum n'alladu.

(iii) "Adjectival":—

Some of those forms in the category (ii) above have, by constant association with nouns, also developed an adjectival force:—

പെരികെ perige [as in പെരികെ നാളെക്കു perige n'āḷekku in Bh Bh, I, p. 20; പെരിക സന്തോഷത്തോടെ perige santōṣattōḍe in Eḻ Rām.].

ആക āga or ആകെ āge [cf. ആകനിലം അറപാടുപറൈ āga n'ilam aṛabadu paṛai in TAS, IV, p. 46 (12th c.)].

വളരെ vaḷare

കുറെ kuṟe < kuṟaya [cf. കുറയത്താമസം kurayat-t-tāmasam in Tuḷḷ, p. 381].

ഏറെ ēṟe

(iv) "Postpositional":—

അടുക്കെ aḍukke

കൂടെ kūḍe

ഒഴികെ oḻige [Tam. oḻiya]

നേരെ n'ēre

All these are of early origin. The final -e appearing in these expressions is, in my view, only a development in Mal. of the sound ə which the final -a of infinitive participles had at an earlier stage and does have even to-day in colloquial Tamil. In the manuscripts of earlier texts and in the inscriptions, one meets forms written as ഏറ ēṟə, വളര vaḷarə, അകല agalə, ഒക്ക okkə [this value exists for this word even to-day in some colloquials], പെരിക perigə, ആക āgə, etc. It is not necessary, therefore, to postulate that -e is the contraction in Mal. of older -a-v-ē. -a-v-ē as in ഒക്കവേ okkavē, ഇരിക്കവേ irikka-v-ē, formed of the infinitive participle and the emphatic ē with the glide -v- between, is of course normal, but this need not have been the ancestor of ഒക്കെ okke, ഇരിക്കെ irikke, etc.

1 It is interesting to note that the original final -a here should have changed in Mal. to ə and then to e at a fairly early stage, as the vocalic glide associated here is only y, the front one, though Tam. infinitive participles embody the back glide v.

(v) In constructions with അരുതു arudu, വേണം vēṇam, വേണ്ടാ vēṇḍā, ആം ām [< āgum], and in compounds with āg-, the old infinitive participle has been kept up (with the elision of the final -a of the infinitive participle):—

ചെയ്യരുതു ceyyarudu;
ചെയ്യണം ceyyaṇam < ceyya vēṇam;
ചെയ്യാം ceyyām [Tam. ceyyal- ām];
ചെയ്യാക് ceyyāg- , കേൾക്കാക് kēḷkkāg-;
ചെയ്യപ്പെട് ceyya-p-peḍ 'to be done'.

(vi) An early change of the infinitive participle to the conjunctive past participle in constructions like the following, sanctioned even for Tamil by N, 346, is reflected in early Mal. illustrations and preserved in the modern dialect (including the present-day colloquial):—

പറയ്ന്തു തുടങ്ങി paṛayndu tuḍaṅṅi [RC, 27]
അമിന്നു തുടങ്ങിനാർ aminnu tuḍaṅṅinār [KG, Vals., l.179]
നന്നായ് ഉടുക്കും n'an'n'āy uḍukkum [KG, Vals., l. 989]

This constructional type is quite common in Mal. to-day, Tamil colloquial usage however, has ŝolla ārambiccān, ŝeyya ārambiccān and nand'āga vāŝīppān, where the original infinitives are retained.

The infinitive participle of the vān type.

This appears in Mal. from the earliest known times and corresponds to the Middle Tamil type [which, as I have pointed out in MOTV, owed its origin to participial nouns like ōḍuvān 'he who will run' being interpreted as infinitive participles of purpose in constructions like ōḍuvān vandān 'he who will run came' > 'he came in order to run'].

There is one structural peculiarity to be noted in the Mal. forms of this type. While Tam. has the ending -bān for bases with final -n and ṇ, Mal shows - mān [cf. Tam. future ḅ for such bases = Mal. -m].

The uses of this participle may be classified thus:—

(i) It is used to denote "purpose", when the forms may be reinforced by āy or āykkoṇḍu:— സാധിപ്പാനായ് sadhippānāy, വാഴ്ത്തുവാനായ്ക്കൊണ്ടു vāḻttuvānāykkoṇḍu; വരുവാനായിട്ടു varuvānāyiṭṭu.

(ii) An action about to happen is indicated by the following :—എന്തിന വെറുതെ ചാവാൻ പോണു cāvān pōṇu [Tuḷḷ., p. 402]; വഞ്ചി മുങ്ങുവാൻപോകുന്നു muṅṅuvān pōgun'n'u.

(iii) "Effect" is denoted when takka is employed, as in കൊല്ലുവാൻ തക്ക കുററംചെയ്തു kolluvān takka kuṯṯam.

(iv) The forms have almost the force of a noun in the following:—ചിന്തിച്ചു വേണം നീ ഒന്നു ചെയ്വാൻ cinticcu vēṇam n'ī on'n'u ceyvān [KG, Kṛṣṇōlp., l. 296], വനത്തിൽപോയ് വേണം ഉണ്മാൻ vanattil pōy vēṇam uṇmān [BhBh, 1, p. 44].

(v) The following are "pregnant" constructions:—ചട്ടി കലങ്ങളും ഉടപ്പാനും മതി uḍappānum madi [Tuḷḷ., p. 357] 'quite possible that the pots and utensils might be shattered'. വരാനും മതി varānum madi; വെളുപ്പാൻ നേരം vēḷuppān n'ēram [Tuḷḷ, p. 325]; വെളുപ്പാൻകാലത്തു് veḷuppān kālattu; ഉണ്ണാൻ നേരത്തു uṇṇān n'ērattu; വരുവാൻ എന്തേ varuvān endē; പറയാൻ ഉണ്ടു് paṟayān uṇḍu.

(vi) കൂട്ടാൻ kūṭṭān 'curry' [<കൂട്ടുവാൻ kūṭṭuvān, as in BhBh, 1, p. 50] and muṟukkān 'pansupari' have almost become nouns to-day.

This infinitive participle type is most active to-day in Mal. with all the significations mentioned above. In Tam. colloquial it is employed to-day only in one context, viz., varuvān ēn, while in Middle Tam. it was employed to denote 'purpose' and in constructions like aṟivān karutt-uṇḍu, pōvan karutt-illai [cf. commentary on V, Dhātup., 8].

As the infinitive participle with -vān, -mān, -ppān does not express "effect", Mal. employs construtions like the following to denote 'effect':—

അറിയുമാറുറചെയ്വാൻ aṟiyum-āṟ-ura ceyvān [RC, 2].

അറിയത്തക്കവണ്ണം പറഞ്ഞു aṟiya-t-takka vaṇṇam paṟaññu [modern].

8. RELATIVE PARTICIPLES.

1. These in Mal. have final -a as in other south Dravidian speeches. The syntactic significations of the rel. participle in Mal. are also on all fours with south Dr. usage.

2. The type ōḍin-a of Tamil is not common in Mal. except in some of the earlier texts; the Śaṅgam Tam. ōḍiya type

has always been the popular form in Mal. ഉണ്ടാനൊരു uṇḍān(a-) oru [US, Intr., 2] and similar instances in the older texts like pōna [<pō-y-i-na], āḍina, etc., do not exist in the modern dialect, though employed as archaisms in poetry.

3. The older texts show forms with the endings -an-a instead of normal -a in the following:—

ചിവന്തന മിളികളോടും civandana miḷigaḷōḍum [RC, 147]
പെയ്തന കണ്ണീരോടും peyd-an-a kaṇṇīrōḍum [RC, 12]
ഇട്ടന ശാപം iṭṭana śāpam [RC, 63]
വളർന്തന ചില്ലിയോടു vaḷarndana cilliyōḍu [RC, 147.]
കൊണ്ടന പരിശാവടു koṇḍana pariśāvadu [TAS, III, p. 81, l. 5]

4. Relative participles are combined with various words to denote specialised syntactic meanings:—

(i) With അളവു aḷavu to denote 'time', as in വന്നളവു van'n'a-ḷavu, വരും അളവു varum-aḷavu, etc.

The use of aḷavu to denote 'time' exists in Middle Tamil.

aḷavum (with the future rel. participle and with other words) denotes 'limit' in Old Mal., as in Early Middle Tam.; and this aḷavum has developed at a very early stage (in Old Mal.) to ഓളം ōḷam [see Chap. V].

(ii) With അപ്പോൾ appōḷ, ഇടം iḍam (eḍam), as in വന്നപ്പോൾ van'n'appōḷ and older നടക്കുന്നപ്പോൾ naḍakkun'n'appōḷ [Bh Bh, 1, p. 64]; പോയേടം pōyēḍam.

(iii) With ആറു āṛu to denote 'manner' and with ആറേ āṛē to denote 'time':—

പറഞ്ഞവാറു paṛañña-v-āṛu; പോകുന്നവാറു pōgun'n'a-v-āṛu; ചെയ്യുമാറു ceyyumāṛu.

പറഞ്ഞവാറേ paṛañña-v-āṛē denotes 'time'. The combination denoting 'time' is usually that of the past relative participle and āṛē.

The combination of the future rel. participle (having um) and āṛu implies 'effect' as in varum-āṛu, āmmāṛu (āgum-āṛu).

Except the type with āṛē denoting time, all these constructions have counterparts in Middle Tam. Many of them persist in Mal. regional colloquials to-day.

(iv) Another Mal. construction (which has its counterpart in Middle Tam.) is the combination of relative participles with-or-(when a following noun is qualified) or with ond'u, on'n'u (when no noun is qualified):—നടപ്പൊരു നേരം nadappōru n'ēram [US, I, 75]; ഉള്ളൊന്റു ull-ōnd'u [US]. This -oru or ōr appears in such constructions before plural nouns also, as in ഞങ്ങൾ ബന്ധുക്കളായുള്ളൊരു ഞങ്ങളെ bandhukkaḷāyuḷḷōru ñaññaḷe [Eḷ Rām., p. 54], ഭാഗ്യവിഹീനന്മാരായിരിപ്പൊരു ഞങ്ങൾക്കു irippōru ñaññaḷkku [BhBh, 2, p. 24]; this would show that oru in these contexts has become a mere "expletive".

5. Mal. allows the use of the "neuter" participial noun to do the duty of the relative participle, as in ഇരുന്നതു കാലം irun'n'adu kālam [KR, Ār., 112], മരുവുന്നതു നേരം maruvun'n'adu n'ēram [Eḷ Rām.]. cf. adu kālam, adu māiiri, idu pōle of Mal. and Middle Tam.

6. Conversely, instances like വിളങ്ങുന്ന കണ്ടാൻ viḷaññun'n'a kaṇḍān [Irupatt., Rām., 16, 67], കേട്ടകൊണ്ടു kēṭṭakoṇḍu [Eḷ. Rām.], വേണ്ടാത്ത കാട്ടുന്ന vēṇḍātta kāṭṭun'n'a [Caṇakky.], വീഴുന്ന കാങ്ങയാൽ vīḻun'n'a kāṇgayāl [Tuḷḷ, p., 482] show that the mere relative participle was used for the participial neuter noun in these contexts.

7. In the following instances, original future finite "irrational" plurals, having been sometimes used appositionally [1] with their subjects, have come to have a "relatival" connection:—

തിരുവിളക്കിനുള്ള പൂമിയാവോ pūmiyāvō [TAS, II, p. 176 -10th c.—Here, the form is followed in the inscriptional text by the names of the particular lands, so much so that the use of pūmiyāvō < pūmi-y-āva) may be regarded as grammaticall "predicative", though the prefixing of the form to the names of the lands suggests a "relatival" or "adjectival" connection].

ഇരുന്നാൽ കൊണ്ടുകൊള്ളും ചെലവാവോ celavāvō [TAS, III, p. 187, 10th c.].

ചെയ്കോപ്പണി cēgō-p-paṇi [TAS, III, p. 50, ll 30, 36—Here the form cēgo=ceyva (ceyvava), has become "adjectival," as in the following instances also.]

1. The appositional nature of these pl. participials is clearly evident in instances like നാമങ്ങൾ വാഴ്ത്തുന്ന ഭക്തരെക്കൊണ്ടു തട്ടിത്തകർത്തു [El. Bh, p, 302]

കരഞ്ഞോ പിള്ളകളും karaññō [Rām. Camp., Kharav. gadya]
പാരിച്ചോ ചില പാറകളും pāriccō [ib., gadya]
ഉപകരിപ്പോ ചില കഥകളെ upakarippō [Pr. Gr. Bh, p. 263]
ശരീരപാതഹേതുഭൂതങ്ങളായിരിപ്പോ ചിലവ irippō cilava [Praiṣ. p. 31]

8. ചെയ്യുവർ ceyvavar [KR, Ār., 18], നടപ്പവർ n'aḍappavar, ആടിടുവോൻറ് āḍīḍuvōnd'u [US, 2, 44], ആവോന് āvōn'n'u [Bh Bh] perhaps presuppose future rel. participles with v, pp, though such participles have no independent existence [except "derivatively" as in 7 above] in Tam. or in Mal.

9. CONDITIONALS AND CONCESSIVES.

1. While the old Tam. conditional ending was -in or- āyin [the latter suffixed to the full tense- form], Middle Tam. had - il and āgil besides the old Tam. endings [V, Dhāt. 10]; -il appears suffixed to the verb-base, and -āgil was suffixed to the finite tense-forms or to the past stem. The earliest Mal. formations are like Middle Tam. ones:

വരിൽ var-il [KR, Bāl., 100.]
തരിൽ taril [Līl., 7, 5, cit.]
കാണുന്നൂതാകിൽ kāṇun'n'ūd-āgil [KG, Saubh., l. 114]
പോയാകിൽ pōyāgil [KG, Syamant., l. 69]
ചെയ്തീടിൽ ceydīḍil [El Bh, p. 258] beside ceydīḍugil.

But on account of the influence of forms like āgil and pōgil [where-g- is a reinforcer appearing in the conditional, the infinitive participle and the future forms], from a very early period -g- has been incorporated in the conditional endings of all verb-bases other than those with the kārita affix-kk:—

കഴികിൽ kaḻigil [TAS, II, p. 174—10th c.]
ചെയ്കിൽ cey-g-il
കൊൾകിൽ koḷ-g-il } [TAS, III, p. 194 ff.]
കുറൈക്കിൽ kuṟaikkil
വരുത്തുകിൽ varuttu-g-il [KR, Bāl., 16]

And this -g-il has become a characteristic Mal. conditional suffix in bases of this type. Cf. L, II, 25.

The -g-il conditional is not current in present-day colloquial which uses the conditional formed of the past stem and -āl; but -gil appears to have been common down till the 19th century.

2. A special development of this -g-il appears in Mal. proverbs in the concessives with -ūl-um, as in the following:—

തിന്നൂലും tinnūlum [MP, No. 462]

കൊടുക്കൂലും koḍukkūlum [ib., No. 89]

I cannot agree with Gundert when he says that the ū of -ūlum is the Mal. "second future affix ū"; on the other hand, it would be more natural to explain forms like tinnūlum from tinnuvilum [< tinnugilum], since - il or -g-il is never suffixed to the future finite (or to any finite tense) in Mal. or in Tamil, and further since even to-day the form on'n'ūlo alternates in the colloquial with on'n'uvilō and on'n'ugilō illustrating, so to say, the phonetic change.

3. -āl, suffixed to the past stem, expresses the conditional idea in Middle Tam. and in Mal., as in Mal. van'n'āl, ceydāl.

This form is very rare in Śaṅgam Tamil and appears to have become active only in early Middle Tam. [V, Dhātu., 10].

Mal. has had this form from the earliest period and it remains the most active conditional form to-day in Mal.

4. The chief concessives are formed, as in Tamil and in other south Dravidian languages, with the samucaccaya-um annexed to the conditionals. In Mal., these are -il-um, and -āl-um [the latter after the past stem].

There are, however, a few forms in Mal. with -ān-um,-ēl-um, and -ēnum. Of these, ānum in forms like ārānum, eṅṅānum, are common and they exist even to-day. ālum, -ēlum and -ēnum, in forms like the following, are Old Mal :—ആരാലും arālum [KG, Rugm, l. 113]; ആരേലും ārēlum [ib., Hēm., l. 68]; എങ്ങേനും eṅṅēnum [RC, 36].

Now, all these endings are Middle Tam. terminations, occurring not only after ār, eṅṅ- as in Mal., but also after verb forms; -ānum and ēnum are concessives in Middle Tam., while, besides ēlum, ēl also occurs as a conditional ending in Middle Tamil.

These endings are absent in Old Tamil in which the conditional is either with -in- suffixed to the verb base as in ceyin, or with āyin [< āg-in, the conditional with -in of āg- 'to become'] suffixed to the tense-form.

I consider that -ān [of-ānum], -ēn [of -ēnum] and -ēl are contractions of-āyin and -āyil [which latter is a variant with -il of āyin].

The phonetic change of -āy-to -ē- is analogous to the change of Mal. n'an'n'āy to colloquial n'an'n'ē.

The variant-ēn-of āyin exists in Telugu also as a conditional ending.

5. In this connection, the following forms of Mal. deserve to be noted:—

[Nom.] ആരാൻ പറയുമോ āran parayumō [Mōkṣ., p. 1]
[Gen.] ആരാന്റെ ārand'e [MP, Nos. 109, 111, 112]
[Acc.[ആരാനെ ārāne [MP, No. 110].
[Third case] ആരാനോടു ārānōḍu [Naḷ Āṭṭ., p. 430 of Univ. Sel.]

6. A suffix vān, expressive of 'doubt' and 'surprise', occurring in instances like the following, from about the period of the campus, is ultimately related to -ān-um, the concessive ending implying 'doubt':—

ആരുവാൻ āruvān [BhBh, 2, p. 43]
എന്തുവാൻ enduvān [Naiṣ. camp.]
ചൊല്ലീടാമോവാൻ collīḍāmōvān [Eḷ Kaivaly. p. 60]
ചിരിക്കയില്ലയോവാൻ cirikkayillayōvān [ib., p. 66]
എത്രവാൻ എത്ര നാളൈക്കുവാൻ etṛavān etṛa n'āḷaikkuvān [Girij,. p. 40]

Kuñjan and others of the 18th century also use it; but it does not exist in the colloquial to-day.

There is little doubt that vān [cf. Gundert's Gr., p. 39], was formed from -ān with the permanent incorporation of a back glide v which appeared originally in forms like uṇḍō-v-ān, cirikkayillayō-v-ān, etc. Semantically the idea of 'doubt' implied by this suffix may be compared to the similar idea of 'doubt' in -ān of ārān, isolated from ānum.

10. VERBAL NOUNS WITH FINAL -GA OR -KKA.

The active employment in Mal. of these verbal nouns with varied syntactic functions is a significant feature of Mal. morphology, which marks off the west coast speech from Tamil.

These Mal. verbal nouns correspond to Tamil forms like ceygai, irukkai, which are sometimes used as inflected nouns or as nominatives in Tamil syntactic constructions; but the uses to which these forms are put in Mal. are more extensive and numerous than in Tamil. In fact, they form indispensable linguistic units in Mal.

(i) They are used as subjects and objects of verbs:—

നിന്തിരുവടിയുടെ പ്രവൃത്തി രക്ഷിക്കയത്രേ n'indiruvaḍiyuḍe pṛa-vṛtti rakṣikka-y-atṛē [BhBh, 1, p. 101].

സംഭ്രമമോടൊരു കാൎയ്യം ചെയ്ക തകാ sambhramamōḍ-oru kāryam ceyga tagā [KR, Kiṣk., 80].

വരുത്തുക ചെയ്യുന്നു varuttuga ceyyun'n'u [BhBh, 1, p. 21].

കാട്ടുക ചെയ്യുന്നതു kāṭṭuga ceyyun'n'adu [Pr. Gr. Bh]

അരുളിച്ചെയ്ക വേണം aruḷi-c-ceyga vēṇam [ib.].

നടക്കയും വീഴ്കയും കേഴ്കയും ചെയ്തു nadakkayum vīḷugayum kēḷugayum ceydu [KG]

ചെയ്കയാകുന്നു ceygayāgun'n'u, ചെയ്കയായിരുന്നു ceyga-y-āyi-run'n'u, ചെയ്കയായിരിക്കും ceyga-y-āyirikkum, ചെയ്കയുണ്ടു ceyga-y-uṇḍu, ചെയ്കയില്ല ceyga-y-illa [used in Mal. with a slightly future force].

(ii) The instrumentals with āl and koṇḍu are very common (as in Tam.); the locative is represented in the literary speech in some contexts; the accusative appears in "comparisonals" with-kāḷ;, the dative is very rare; and the genitive is absent.

Instr. തെറുകയാൽ teṛuga-y-āl [RC].
എങ്കയിനാൽ eṅga-y-in-āl [KR, Kiṣk.]
പോകകൊണ്ടു pōga koṇḍu

Loc. ദേവാനാം കാണ്കയിൽ ഇച്ഛയില്ല kāṇga-y-il [BhBh]; ഭോഗമില്ല ജീവിക്കയിൽ jīvikkayil [El Bh, p. 290]; ധനമി യിൽ വാഴ്കയിൽ മരണം നല്ല vāḷga-y-il.

Acc. കേട്ടീടുകേക്കാൾ kēṭṭīḍugē-k-kāḷ [Irup. Rām., 11, 42].

Dat. Though L [2,11, comm.] objects to forms like kāṇgai-kku, rare datives like the following occur in some texts: പേറിടുകൈക്കു pēr-iḍugaikku [Rām. camp., Vicch. gadya]; ഇവർക്കും ഇഷ്ടമില്ലം

ഇഷ്ടമില്ലായ്കയ്ക്കു iṣṭam-illāygaikku [Cāṇakky., IV, l. 19], കൊള്ളക്കൊടുക്കയ്ക്കും koḍukkaikkum [KU, p. 39].

(iii) The peculiar construction of the following type (met with often in BhBh and not unrepresented in other texts) may be noted here; അവൻനിന്റെ അനുജത്തിയല്ലോ, ബാലയാകയുമുണ്ടു, കല്യാണിയാകയുമുണ്ടു, കൃപണയാകയുമുണ്ടു bāla-y-āgayum uṇḍu, kalyāṇi-y-āgayum uṇḍu, kṛpaṇa-y-āgayum uṇḍu [BhBh, 1, p. 5].

The following points may be noted in connection with these Mal. forms.

1. In structure, the Mal. forms with their final -a resemble the Tamil optatives [with -ga or -kka] and the Mal. representatives of these Tamil optatives. It is quite conceivable that originally they were identical.

2. These verbal nouns should be carefully distinguished in function from the old infinitive participles of the type colla-t-tuniññēn; for in old Mal. the verbal noun type is not employed to perform the duty of the infinitive participle, though usages exist like കാങ്കക്കാങ്കത്തളൎന്നു kāṇga kāṇga-t-taḷarn'n'u [Koḍiya-vi-aham, 103] and എല്ലാവരും കാങ്കപ്പിടിച്ചിഴച്ചതും ellāvarum kāṇga [Eḷ Bh, p. 359]; മത്സ്യപ്പരിഷകൾ കാങ്കത്തന്നെ kāṇga-t- tanne [Tuḷḷ, p. 83]; kāṇg- [KBhāg, p. 102].

3. It may also be noted here that while Mal. uses these verbal nouns for a sequence of actions connected together with the samuccaya -um, Tam. employs only the infinitive participles in such contexts: Mal. n'aḍakkayum vīḻugayum kēḻugayum ceydu; Tamil n'aḍakka-v-um vīḻa-v-um āḻa-v-um ceydān.

The fact that the infinitive of the type of vīḻa, aḻa, ceyya has also the force of a verbal noun in constructions like the above and like the others dealt with in the chapter on Infinitives [cf. ceyya vēṇam and ceyga vēṇam in Mal.], leads me to query if these verbal nouns with-g-a and their structural relatives, the optatives with-g-a, may not have been variants of the infinitive, formed with the reinforcer -g-. [For the kāritas, the -kk- already exists in the base, so much so that sometimes this in itself was felt as insufficient and an additional-u-ga was optionally tacked on in Mal. (and rarely in Tamil optatives), as in irikkuga beside irikka].

11. IMPERATIVES AND PERMISSIVES.

1. As in Tamil, verb-roots are used as singular imperatives; but two chief Mal. peculiarities may be noted:—

(a) Literary Tamil does not allow the incorporation of the enunciative vowel u after bases with final l, ḷ, n, ṇ, y, r, ḻ; but in Mal. this is optionally permitted in literary texts (and of course in the colloquial also). Līl., III, 24, expressly points this out. Mal. singular imperatives like the following, therefore, freely appear in the texts:—ചൊല്ലു collu [gemination of l due to sandhi!] [KG], നില്ലു സമീപെ n'illu samīpe [Rām. camp.].

(b) Another peculiarity is that, while Tam. does not at all incorporate the kārita reinforcer in the singular imperatives of bases having these reinforcers, Mal. permits the embodying of -kk- in the singular imperatives, though in regional colloquials the -kk- may be omitted:—ഇരിക്കു് irikku, നടക്കു് n'aḍakku, etc., corresponding to Tam. iru, n'aḍa, etc. But aviḍe-k-kiḍı, iri-y-eḍō, eṇi-y-eḍō [< eḻun'il-], etc., are also heard in regional colloquials. So far as the texts are concerned, even Kuñjan uses forms like iri n'ī [Tuḷḷ.] without -kk- .

The reason for the frequent incorporation of -kk- in singular imperatives is, I think, the popularity enjoyed by the polite imperatives (derived from optatives) of the type of a eḍukka in Mal.

2. There is a second person pl. imperative form with-v-in, m-in, -pp-in, in which -v-, -m- and -pp- correspond to similar particles in the future tense and in the future infinitive participle of the -vān type.

The corresponding Tamil type has -min for all bases.

I think that the Mal. type may not be directly connected with the Tam. form. It is possible that Tam. -m- in -m-in is a plural ending appearing in other contexts in Tamil [e. g. in ōm, ām, am, the personal endings of the first person pl. tense, and in mār, a plural ending of nouns], while Mal. appears to have formed this type with -v-in and its sandhi modifications -m-in [after final nasals of verb -bases, as in kāṇ-m-in] and -pp-in [after kārita bases, as in uraippin < uraikk+(u)v-in, which last-mentioned form, I may remark by the way, is also current in Mal., i. e., without the sandhi change of kk+v=pp.]

3. Instances like kēḷāy [RC, 68], kāṇīr [KR, Kiṣk., 195—Pl. Imp.], koḍutt-iḍāye [RC, 74], which are imperatives with second personal endings, are not Mal.; they appear to have been used in these Old Mal. texts in imitation of Tam. literary usage [cf. TC, 450]. അറിയാ aṛiyā [KR, Kiṣk., 81] and പാരാ pāra [ib., 141] are singular imperatives with final -y elided.

4. The polite imperative of Mal. with- u-ga embodied always in ordinary bases and optionally in bases having the kārita -kk, has to be derived historically from the Middle Tamil optative [for which latter, see my MOTV].

അറിക നീ aṛi-ga n'ī [RC, 110]

ചൊല്ലുക നീ collu-ga n'ī [RC, 64]

The final -ga sometimes appears also lengthened in Mal. as in അറികാ aṛigā [Eḻ Cint., p. 28], ചൊല്കാ colgā [Sabhā., l. 444], koḷgā [ib., l. 580], അറികാ aṛigā [TAS, VII p. 153]; വരികാ varigā and വാഴ്കാ [KU, p. 15 and p. 23].

The Old Tamil optative,according to TC,226, and to general usage in the Śaṅgam texts, is allowed only after the third person. But in late Śaṅgam texts and in Middle Tamil [See my MOTV], the use of the optative was extended to other persons,—a usage which was definitely and expressly recognized by Nannūl in its sūtra 338.

This Middle Tamil practice is reflected in the oldest Mal. texts completely, in which the optatives are associated with all persons.

In the earlier texts,[1] the third personal optatives were of course common: n'innuḍe uḍal ponniṛamāgā [KR, Utt., 193], adu n'ilka, tiruvuḷḷam āvūdāga [RC, 14], celvōnāga [L, II, 25], bhagavān ñaññaḷe rakṣippūdāga [BhBh, 1, p. 100], rāman jayippūdāga [Eḻ Rām.], pōgadellām [Eḻ Bh]. Gradually, however, the optative has become a mere second personal "polite" imperative in Mal.

---

1 Instances like അറിവോമാക, വിഴവോമാക [KR, Ar., 153], കൊൾകൊണ്ടേവോമാക [KR, Kisk., 117] represent a favourite type with the Panikkars. This is a Tamilism.

5. The future participials with final -adu, -idu,- ūdu (or udu) have an "imperative" value [cf. § 6 above]:—

രാമൻ പിറകെകളവദു് kaḷavadu [RC, 65]; പോവിദു് നാം ഇതുവഴി pōvidu [KR, Bāl., 77]; കൊടുപ്പൂദു koḍuppūdu [RC, 76]; van'n'-āvūd-enikku [KBhāg., p. 74]; കുറിക്കൊൾവൂദു് koḷvūdu [US 2, 97].

6. The -ū aorists are used with an imperative force in all numbers and persons in the old texts [cf. § 6]:—

കേൾപ്പൂ kēḷpū [US, 1, 36]; നാം പറഞ്ഞു കൊൾവൂ koḷvū [KG]; ചെൽവൂതാവൂ celvūd-āvu [L, II, 25 cit.]; പിന്നെയും പിന്നെയും കേട്ടാവൂ kēṭṭāvū [BhBh, 1, p. 26].

7. A benedictive with -āga suffixed to future participials with ūdu, occurs in old texts:—

വെൽവൂതാക velvūdāga [US, 1, 38]; ജയിപ്പൂതാക രാമൻ jayip-pūd-āga [Eḷ Rām.].

രക്ഷിപ്പൂതാകേണമേ rakṣippūd-āgēṇamē occurs in BhBh, 2, p. 19.

8. The ending -ṭṭē [< oṭṭē=oṭṭu 'allow'+emphatic ē] is used in Mal. as a "permissive" in the first and third persons:—

n'ōkkaṭṭē n̄ān [KG, Ul., l. 279], irun'n'ōṭṭē [Bh Bh, 1, p. 44 —3rd person] < irun'n'u+koḷḷaṭṭē.

āgaṭṭē is syntactically important in constructions like യശോദയാകട്ടെ yaśōdayāgaṭṭē 'as for yaśōda' [Bh Bh, 1, p. 33].

The Travancore regional colloquial പറഞ്ഞാട്ടെ paṛaññāṭṭē is a construction constituted of paṛaññu and kāṇaṭṭē; cf. Kuñjan's എന്നുടെ വായിൽ പൂക്കൊണ്ടാട്ടെ, നീയിനിമോഹം ഒഴിച്ചേച്ചാട്ടെ, വായിനു നേരെ കുതിച്ചേച്ചാട്ടെ pukkōṇḍāṭṭē, oḷiccēccāṭṭē, kudiccēccāṭṭē [Tuḷḷ, p. 409].

9. The concessive with the ending -āl-um, standing by itself, does duty in Mal. for a kind of polite imperative for the second person. It is a contraction of constructions like നിങ്ങൾ പോയാലും നന്നു് n'iṅṅāḷ pōyāl-um n'an'n'u 'it would be well if you were to go' implying a polite wish, from which n'an'n'u 'it would be well' has been dropped.

This type occurs in the earliest Mal. texts and has continued to be active down till to-day: നിങ്ങൾ കൊന്നാലും n'iṅṅāḷ kon'-n'ālum [RC, 402]; ceydālum [KG].

10. The combination of the old infinitive participle with ām [< āg-um] expresses in Mal. "permission" besides "ability":—kuḷaikkam [RC, 18].

This corresponds to Middle Tam. ceyyal-ām type. The Mal. type occurs in the earliest known period and has continued to exist down till to-day. RC and US have the type ceyyām beside the Tamilistic ceyyalām. The Paṇikkars, KG and later texts (excepting VR which consciously employs the Tamilistic ceyyalām type beside the Mal. ceyyām, just as it has used many other Tamilisms deliberately) use the ceyyām type exclusively.

Functionally, the type in Mal. has the following meanings:—(i) avan varām, avar varām, avan van'n'irikkām in connection with the third person, imply 'possibility'.

(ii) enikku pōgām, ayāḷkku varām, ñaṅṅaḷkk-eḍukkām signify either 'ability' of the person concerned or 'permission' accorded to him by another. The dative is associated here.

(iii) ñān varām, ñaṅṅaḷ tarām, where the first person is involved, would mean a 'promise' on the part of the speaker. This last-mentioned usage with the first person is unique in Mal., having been in existence from a very early period: ñānum.. ceyyām [KR, Ār., 159].

12. PARTICIPIAL NOUNS.

1. In Tamil two sets of participial nouns could be distinguished from the point of view of their structure:— the older variety which structurally is the same as the finite tense-forms without the augment-an; and the more modern variety, restricted to the third person and constituted of the relative participle and avaḷ, avan, avar, adu.

Mal. generally has only third personal participials (belonging to both these types). In Tam. a participial noun like kaṇḍēn 'I who saw' could be "inflected" with "case"-endings, though it should be said that the construction is perhaps exclusively literary; Mal. does not possess such participial nouns in the first or the second persons. Again, while Tam. may use kaṇḍān, kaṇḍāḷ, kaṇḍār as participials, Mal. prefers either kaṇḍōn, etc., or kaṇḍavan, etc., Cf. ലാവണ്യാംബുധിയാം യോന്റെ [Bh Bh, 2, p. 8] and നില്ലോണ [ib., p. 9].

2 Old Mal. had future participial nouns like വാഞ്ഞുമവർ vāññumavar [KBhr, p. 125], വേണ്ടുമവ vēṇḍumava [ib., p. 116], പററുമതല്ല pat't'umadalla [KR, Utt., 571], പോക്കുമതല്ല pōkkumadalla [RC 13].

3. Participials are used with almost the force of finite tense-forms in Old Mal., particularly in the third personal present tense forms (for which the type ചെയ്യുന്നാൻ ceyyun'n'ān with the personal ending ān is conspicuously absent in Mal.):— കാനനഭൂമിയിൽ നിന്നെൻ ഭർത്താ കാലവശം പ്രാപിക്കുന്നോൻ prāpikkun'n'ōn [KR, Ār., 172].

ദശമുഖൻ ഇവിടെ വരുന്നോൻ varun'n'ōn [KR, Utt., 251].

ആരിഹ ഭരിപ്പോർ ār-iha bharippōr [KBhr, p. 116].

രാജഭൃത്യന്മാർ നിങ്ങളെ ബന്ധിപ്പോർ bhandippōr [BhBh, 2, p. 22].

ദേവകൾ യുദ്ധത്തിന്നു് അരികിൽ നിന്റെ ശരങ്ങളേററ മണ്ടിപ്പോവോർ maṇḍi-p-pōvōr [BhBh, 1, p. 17].

4. The participials of the type of iraññūdum, pōvūdu, eḍuppūdu, ceyvūdu, ōḍūdu occur in all Old Mal. texts, but they are most numerous in BhBh, KU, Brahm. Among New Mal. texts, this type is met with in Kucēl. vañjip. and occasionally in other texts. It has gone out of use to-day.

Its use in constructions like പോവൂതും ചെയ്തു pōvūdum ceydu for normal പോകയും ചെയ്തു pōgayum ceydu is quite common in BhBh, KU and Brahm.

13. APPELLATIVES.

One of the special features of Tamil is its appellatives in all persons, like koḍiyai 'thou art cruel', n'āyinēn 'I am like a dog.' Mal. has only the third personal appellatives, though older aḍiyēn [modern aḍiyan] and Kaṇṇaśśan's ellīrum may be regarded as appellatives of other "persons".

Some Mal. appellatives that have now gone out of use are the following:—pon-n'iṛattāḷ, anna-n'aḍayāḷ, simhattān, n'āgattān, velattān, maṛkkaḍattān, eññōn, eññōḷ, aññēn [modern pl. aññēr or aññōr], eññanattōn, dūrattān, cārattūdu, eviḍattūdu; and (by analogy) kānanamtannilōn [KG, Khāṇḍ., l. 242], n'innuḍe pinnilōn [KG Gōp., l. 525].

Some older relative appellative participles [like common forms of the type of valiya, ceṛiya, etc., which are still current] are aḷagiya [KR, Ār., 137], kārkaṛun'iṛattiya [RC].

14. NEGATIVE FORMATIONS.

1. The aorist negatives with personal endings exist in Old Mal. texts. They are numerous in the writings of the Paṇikkars; they are represented in certain types in KG, but in Eḻ they have disappeared except for vallēn in the *cliche* colla vallēn.

oḻiyēn [RC, 46]
oḻiyāy [KR, Kiṣk., 109]
miṇḍāḷ [L,IV, 23]
pōrādu [US, I, 55].
aṟiyōm [KR, Kiṣk., 248].
kaividār [KG Khāṇḍ, l. 222].

It is quite probable that these were purely literary, inasmuch as from the time of the earliest texts, the third person "neuter" pl. negative tense with ā [cf. TC, 9 and 216] had been used in Mal. for all persons and numbers:—

കണ്ടുമുടിയാ നീ mudiyā n'ī [L, VIII, 6, cit.].
ഞാൻ അമർച്ചെയ്യാ ñān ceyyā [KBhr, 48].
നീ അറിയാ n'ī aṟiyā [RC, 79].
സീത എന്നിക്ക പൊരുന്നാ sīta porun'n'ā [KR, Ār., 49].
പിരാട്ടി താരാ tārā [US, 2 45].

This ā was more active in Old Mal. and in the earlier stages of New Mal.; it persists to-day only in പോരാ pōrā, വയ്യാ vayyā, കൂടാ kūḍā, വേണ്ടാ vēṇḍā.

The employment of the form with ā for all persons and numbers is significant in that it was this obliteration of its original third person "neuter" plural function that perhaps led to its being considered as a negative verb-stem to which tense-affixes were attached, and to the unique Mal. forms (discussed below) being constituted.

2. From the earliest known literary period, there appears in Mal. a series of unique conjugated negatives in which the stem with the particle -ā- is followed by tense-endings or verbal suffixes. Among the finites, the past and the present are met with, while the future is less common; besides, participles, prohibitives and verbal nouns based on the same stem numerously occur. The chronological frequency of these forms is adverted to below, but I may state here that in

present-day Mal., except the past finite (regionally), the past conj.participle and the verbal noun, the other formations have ceased to exist. No Dravidian language other than Mal. shows these formations.

Present tense. [1]

അറിയായിന്റിടു aṟiyāyind'idu [US, 2, 30].
പൊറുക്കരുതായുന്നു[2] poṟukk-arudāyun'n'u [KG, Gōp., 2, l. 481].
കാണായിന്നു kāṇāyin'n'u [ib., Kamsamantr., l. 128].
കളയായുന്നു kaḷayāyun'n'u [Rām. camp. Sitāpar., g. 4].
വാരായിന്നു vārāyin'n'u [ib.]
നാം ചെയ്യായിന്നു nām ceyyāyin'n'u [Bh Bh, 1, p. 96].
ഇല്ലായുന്നു illāyun'n'u [ib., 1, p. 103.]
ഞാൻ കാണായിന്നു ñān kāṇāyin'n'u [Naiṣ. camp.]
ചെയ്യായിന്നു ceyyāyin'n'u [Eḷ Bh.]
കൂടായിന്നു kūḍāyin'n'u [Bhāg].

Past tense.

വരാഞ്ഞു varāññu [KG, Kāḷiya., l. 87].
നിങ്ങൾ അന്യായപ്പെടാഞ്ഞു n'iṅṅaḷ anyāya-p-peḍāññu [KU, p. 7].
കൊടാഞ്ഞാൻ കാളിയൻ koḍāññān kāḷiyan [Bh Bh, 1, 71].

Phonetically -āññ- was derived from -ā-ynd- [cf. āṟāññ- < āṟāynd-'having carefully searched'], where -ā- is the negative particle, and-(y)nd- has the dental nasal associated with the past-forming affix -d-. For y, see below.

The past finite, the past participle, the relative participle, the conditional and the concessive,—all of which have the past stem of the type ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞ് ceyyāññ-,-are heard even to-day.

---

1. Bh Bh and PrGrBh show numerous present tense finites; the latter has അറിയായുന്നില്ല [p. 261, a form in which illa reinforces the negative idea], ഉരിയായുന്നു [p. 337], അനമിക്കപ്പെടായുന്നു [p. 337], ഇളക്കരുതായുന്നു [p. 53], കൊടായുന്നു, ചെയ്യായുന്നു, സേവിയായുന്നു, etc.

2. il-, al- and arud-, when conjugated, always take on the endings of this type because the negative idea is inherent in these bases.

The future tense.

Though instances are rare, I have noted the following:—

വരായും varāyum, the future with -um in Līl. 7, 5, citation. [താരാനോ തരുമോ തരിൽപ്പുലടിനും വരായുമോ ? tārānō tarumō varāyumō].

ഇടർപാരായ്വാർ iḍar pārāyvār [KR, Utt., 109],—a future with -v- and personal ending.

വാൽവിടായ്വൂ vāl viḍāyvū [Bh Bh, 1, p. 45], an instance of the "aoristic" type with ū ; ഐയ്യും എടാഴിവു eḍāḷivu [Brahm.]

The future relative participle kāṇāyum-bōḷ-in Bh 1, p, 110, and വാടായും in Rājaratn. [57], and the participial nouns kōḍāyvadinnu [RC, 42], and നിവിരായ്വതിന്നു n'ivirāyvadinnu [Girij., p. 80] are connected forms.

Other verb forms.

1. Conjunctive past participles:—അറിവില്ലയാഞ്ഞു ariv-illa-y-āññu [RC, 44], അല്ലയാഞ്ഞിട്ടു allayāññiṭṭu [KG, Rugm. l. 815].

2. Relative present and past participles:—കാണായുന്ന kāṇā-y-un'n'a [Bh Bh, 1, p. 119], വാടീടായുന്ന vāḍīḍāyun'n'a [Rām. camp., Ravaṇōdbh., 1], പുറപ്പെടാഞ്ഞ purappeḍāñña [Kucēl. vanji., l. 284], കാണാഞ്ഞ ഞാൻ kāṇāñña ñān [ib., l. 287].

3. Infinitive participle of "purpose":—

ബാധ വരായ്വാൻ bādha varāyvān [KR, Bāl., 64]
തട്ടായ്വാൻ taṭṭāyvān [Eḷ Bh]
തോലായ്വാൻ tōlāyvān [KR, Bāl., 253]
വീഴായ്വാൻ vīḷāyvān [ib., 116]

This has disappeared to-day, though even 16th and 17th century writers were using it.

The type represented by varād-irippān [normally related to the Tam. negative infinitive participle] has now displaced varāyvān.

4. A polite imperative with -āy-ga occurs in the texts:—

നീ മറിയായ്ക n'ī mariyāyga [KR, Ār., 5].

അറിവുടയോർ കൊടായ്ക ariv-uḍayōr koḍāyga [KR, Kiṣk, 122-3rd person!].

5. A second person plural imperative with -vin was very common down till the 16th and 17th centuries.

തളരായ്വിൻ taḷarāyvin [KR, Ār.]

നില്ലായ്വിൻ n'illāyvin [KG, Rugm., l. 1,002]

ഭയപ്പെടായ്വിൻ bhayappeḍāyvin [Eḷ Bh]

ഓടായ്വിൻ ōḍāyvin [Eḷ Bh, p. 341]

ഉഴറായ്വിൻ uḷaṛāyvin, ചൊല്ലായ്വിൻ collāyvin [Bhāg, p. 105]

മിണ്ടായ്വിൻ miṇḍāyvin [17th century Paḍappāṭṭu, p. 21]

6. Conditionals with -āygil, -āyga-y-āl:—കൊടാകിൽ koḍāgil in a tenth century inscription [TAS, III, p. 176]

കാണരുതായ്കയാൽ kāṇ-arudāygayāl [KG]

അല്ലയായ്കിൽ allayāygil [RC, 146]

[This alternates with അല്ലാഴികിൽ allāḷigil or അല്ലയാഴികിൽ allayāḷigil; for the change of -y- to ḷ, cf. the colloquial corruption aḷaikk- for ayakk- 'to send'].

ഇവ്വണ്ണം ഇരാകിൽ [TAS, III, p. 32 —12th c.]

കൊടായ്കിൽ koḍāygil [RC, 82]

ചെയ്തീലായ്കിൽ ceydīlāygil and പറഞ്ഞീലായ്കിൽ paṛaññīlāygil [KU, p. 33]

ഇല്ലൈയായ്കിൽ illaiyāygil [CAR, VII, p. 10]

The type of പറയാഞ്ഞാൽ paṛayāññāl is common today; but forms like paṛayāygil are not heard.

7. Verbal nouns with -āyga:—

മറിയായ്കകൊണ്ടു mariyāyga koṇḍu [KR, Ār., 7]

പിഴ ചെയ്യായ്കവേണ്ടും piḻa ceyyāyga vēṇḍum [RC, 322]

മുനിയായ്ക നമുക്കു് അരകു് muniyāyga [KR, Kiṣk., 159].

ഇല്ലാഴിക കൊണ്ടു illāḷiga koṇḍu [Kuc. Vaññip., l. 218]

This type is common even today in expressions like അറിയായ്ക കൊണ്ടല്ലാ ഞാൻ ഈ വണ്ടിയിൽ കയറിയതു ariyāyga koṇḍallā ñān vaṇḍiyil kayaṛiyadu.

8. KR, Sund. has forms like കാണായ്വണ്ണം kāṇāyvaṇṇam [78], വാഴായ്വണ്ണം vaḷāyvaṇṇam [249] beside normal negative rel. participles like kāṇā, vāḷā, etc. as in Tamil. The presence of the -y- in the Mal. forms is significant in as much as it is this -y- that has led to the palatalised past stem type of varāññ- in Mal.

It would be interesting to inquire how these unique Mal. negatives were formed. Tamil has the aorist negative type in which, as Caldwell has already pointed out [Comp. Gr., p. 474],

the negative idea is associated with the particle ā which appears also in the relative participle of the type ceyyā. In Tamil, no special forms showing tense-afixes exist; nor does any Dravidian language for that matter evidence such negative tense-forms as those of Mal.

In the first place, it is clear that the Mal. forms are founded upon a negative stem with ā; for, this -ā is conspicuous in all of them. Secondly, a new y has cropped up in all the forms of this type in Mal.; in the past stem, its original existence is attested by the palatalised ññ [< y+nd]. Whence is the y here? I am inclined to think that it may have originated as a glide in present tense forms like kāṇā+y+in'n'- in which the front glide is quite characteristically Mal., as the analogy of vāḍā-y-īdu വാടാ യിടു in the commentary on Līl, III, 1, comm. distinctly shows. The-y- thus associated with the type was perhaps permanently embodied in all forms. Even the relative participle, inherited from the parent language, of the type of ceyyā appears sometimes to have embodied this y in Mal: cf. കാണായ്വണ്ണം kāṇāyvaṇṇam and വാഴായ്വണ്ണം vāḻāyvaṇṇam of KR, Sund., already cited.

The Mal. negative forms of this category are thus derivative in origin. Further, it may also be noted that forms like കാണാ യിന്നു kāṇāyin'n'u, വാരായിന്ദു vārāyind'u with the present tense affix in'n'[having i] also point to the fact that these forms had their origin after Mal. developed its present tense affix from Middle Tam. -gind'- but before -un'n'-[with -u-] was developed or popularised.

Distribution in the texts.

This category is met with in Old Mal. texts, though all forms are not equally numerous. The following types: ചെയ്യായ്ക ceyyāyga, used as the verbal noun and the polite imperative, ചെയ്യായ്വിൻ ceyyāyvin [plural prohibitive], ചെയ്യായ്വാൻ ceyyāyvān [future participle with -vān] are quite common in the works of the Paṇikkars, in RC, KG and in Eḷ.

The future tense finites with um or ū as in ചെയ്യായും ceyyāyum or ചെയ്യായ്വൂ ceyyāyvū are rare, but not unrepresented in Old Mal.

In the campus and in the prose work Bh Bh, present tense and future tense stems are very frequent, besides the other types.

In KG, the future finite is non-existent; the present exists though not numerously; the others are common.

In El, the present tense form appears rarely [ceyyāyun'n'u in Bh, kūḍāyun'n'u in Bhāg.], and the future stem is represented only in participial neuter nouns; but all other types are frequently represented.

It may be observed that the negative types, inherited directly from the parental language, ചെയ്യാതിരിക്കുന്നു ceyyādirikkun'n'u, ചെയ്യാതിരുന്നു ceyyādirun'n'u, ചെയ്യാതിരിക്കും ceyyādirikkum and ceyyāda, etc. already existed side by side with the special Mal. developments ceyyāyun'n'u, etc. Such forms, directly inherited from the parent speech, appear to have gradually displaced, after the period of El, the types ceyyāyun'n'u, ceyyāyum, ceyyāyvū, ceyyāyvin, ceyyāyvān and the polite imperative ceyyāyga.

The only types that exist in the modern colloquials are ചെയ്യായ്ക ceyyāyga as a verbal noun, the past finite ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞു ceyyāññu used regionally, the participle ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞ് ceyyāññ-, the conditional ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞാൽ ceyyāññāl, and (in regional colloquials) the relative participle ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞ ceyyāñña.

These present-day types alone are frequently met with in New Mal. after the transitional stage of El. Occasionally, however, the following are also represented in the 17th and the 18th century texts:—

പോകായ്ക pōgāyga as a proh. [VR, p. 186]; കരുതീടായ്ക karudīḍāyga [ib., p. 54]; കോപിയായ്ക kōpiyāyga [Kōṭṭ. Āṭṭ., p. 74]; khēdiyāyga [Naḷ. Āṭṭ.].

മന്മഥാർത്തി തവ വന്നിടായ്വതിന്നു van'n'iḍāyvadinnu [Kōṭṭ. Āṭṭ., p. 69].

അരുളായ്വാൻ aruḷāyvān [Koṭṭārakk. Āṭṭ., p. 113]
ഇല്ലായ്വാൻ illāyvān [Kōṭṭ. Āṭṭ.]
തടവുകൾ തെല്ലും വരായ്വാൻ varāyvan [Tuḷḷ, p. 477];
കാഴ്ചബോധം ഇല്ലായ്വാൻ illāyvān [Viṣṇ., p. 76]
These, however, are not common in New Mal.

Negative verb-forms normally descended from the parent language.

1. Conjunctive participles of the ceyyādu type abound in RC, KR, KBh, etc.

While ceyyādu represents the Tam. type, ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞു് cey-yāññ- [see supra] is a Mal. development [<*ceyyāyndu], in which the y (met with also in ചെയ്യായ്വിന്നു, etc.) has "palatalised" the past affix.

The ചെയ്യാതു് type appears as ചെയ്യാതെ ceyyādē even in Old Mal., as in KR.

While ceyyādē expresses merely the idea of the negative, the participle ceyyāññu has the additional connotation of "cause" in Mal.; further, the conditional with -āl is directly formed only with ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞു് as in ചെയ്യാഞ്ഞാൽ ceyyāññāl.

The rel. participle ceyyāda has now changed to ceyyātta; the change perhaps occurred very early; for, a 13th c. inscription [TAS, III] has ചെല്ലാത്തതിന്നു് cellāttadinnu.

The relative participles of the type of ceyyād-irikkun'n'a, ceyyād-irun'n'a, the imperatives ceyyād-irikku, ceyyād-irippin, the conditionals ceyyād-irikkil and ceyyād-irun'n'āl, the infinitive participle ceyyad-irippān, the verbal noun ceyyād-irikkuga are all based upon the combination of ceyyādu, the aoristic conjunctive participle and different forms of ir-'to be'; these are most common today.

In this connection, I may refer to the modern colloquial type ചെയ്യാണ്ടു് ceyyāṇḍu which goes back in origin to ചെയ്യാതെകൊണ്ടു ceyyādē koṇḍu, where koṇḍu makes the "action" enure to the subject, as in ceydu koṇḍu. Gundert [Gr., p. 292] postulates kaṇḍu കണ്ടു് instead of കൊണ്ടു് koṇḍu, though he also cites അറിയാതെകൊണ്ടിരുന്നു on p. 306 of his Gr. I think that കൊണ്ടു koṇḍu is the correct form, and this has been replaced in many Mss. and printed texts by കണ്ടു് in this context on account of "confusion". The participle koṇḍu of koḷ-is used in many Dr. languages with this force of making the action enure to the subject in affirmative constructions; Tam. and Mal. have only extended this usage to the negatives. This is clearly proved by the following instances: നിന്റെ ഹാനിവരാതെ കൊള്ളാം varāde koḷḷām [CBh, p. 309]; എൻ വായിലുള്ള കന്നുകിടാക്കളെക്കൊല്ലാതെകൊണ്ടാകിൽ kollādē koṇḍ-āgil [KG, Vals., l. 246]; കുമ്പാതെകൊള്ളുവാൻ kumbāde koḷḷuvān [ib., Rugnan., l. 122]; താരാതെകൊള്ളുവാൻ ഇച്ഛയുണ്ടു tārāde koḷḷuvān [ib., Syamant., l. 232]; കൊല്ലാതെ കൊള്ളാഞ്ഞതു് എന്തേ നീ kollāde koḷḷāññad-endē n'ī [Eḻ. Bh, p. 379].

Middle Tam. used such forms commonly: cf., e. g., നടങ്കാതേ കോൾ n'aḍuṅgāḍē koḷ in Naccinārkiniyar's commentary on Kalittogai, I, 17, 2.

2. The common Mal. negative finites inherited from the parent language are the following:—

ചെയ്യുന്നില്ല ceyyuṉṟilla—cf. Middle Tam. ceygind'ilēn etc.

ചെയ്തില്ല ceydilla— ,, ceydilan, etc.

Old ചെയ്വില്ല ceyvilla [KR, Sund., 95] } ,, ceygilen,[1] etc.
New ചെയ്യില്ല ceyyilla }

Both n'adakkilla [KR, Ār.] and n'aḍappīla [El Bh] exist in Mal.

From the earliest extant texts downwards, these negatives have remained without personal endings in Mal:— അറിഞ്ഞീല ariññīla [US, I, 28], അറിവു വന്നില്ല arivu vaṉṟilla [RC, 35]; പുത്രർ ഭവിച്ചില്ല putrar bhaviccilla [KR, Bāl., 13]; വരുവില്ല തളർച്ചയും varuvilla taḷarccayum [RC, 721].

3. ചെയ്കയില്ല ceyga-y-illa, based as it is on ചെയ്ക ceyga [verbal noun type, so popular in Mal.] is unique. KR [Bāl., 5] and US [I, 133] and RC [709] already have representatives of this type which is also so very common today to express the negative tense-idea.

4. The following "prohibitives" are special Mal. formations with negative significations, constituted of the old affirmative infinitive participle of the verb-base and negative forms:—

(i) ചെയ്യൊല്ലാ cey-y-ollā [ceyya+olla—Note elision of the final -a of the inf. participle]

ollā is the aoristic negative form of ol. This occurs in the earliest texts like US, RC, KR, etc.

It has assumed even the form ചെയ്ക്കൊല്ലാ cey-g-ollā in some Mss. of KR [cf. Kiṣk., 101].

ഓർക്കൊല്ലാതേ ōṛk-ollādē [KG, Kams., l. 590] ഒരുങ്കൊല്ലാതെ [KG, Rugm., l. 298], കൊല്ലൊല്ലാതെ kollollāde [Bh Bh, 1, p. 15],

---

1 The old commentator of V regards [comm. on Sutra 11 of V, Dhatup] നടക്കിലേൻ etc. as a present tense negative type; but the instances in Middle Tam. texts show the future meaning, generally speaking; and this perhaps is more in fitting with the future-denoting force of -g, as in ഏറ്റുകോ etc.

ത്യജിക്കൊല്ലാതെ tyajikollāde [ib., p. 108] are peculiar formations, with ollāde on the analogy of n'illāde, ceyyāde.

(ii) ചെയ്യല്ലേ ceyyallē, a very common prohibitive in the colloquial today, is a type represented only in texts after the period of Eḻ. The older texts including Eḻ use generally the type ചെയ്യൊല്ലാ ceyyollā; but എത്തീടല്ലേ ettīḍallē is a rare instance met with in Rām· camp., Sitāpari., gadya. കൊടിക്കല്ലേ kodikkallē, ത്യജിക്കല്ലേ tyajikkallē occur in Kunjan's Tuḷḷ. Such forms occur in other texts of this and the following periods. Perhaps, this type is a derivative from the type ചെയ്യൊല്ലാ ceyyollā; for, I find forms like വയ്ക്കൊല്ലേ vaikkollē in the 17th century Paḍappāṭṭu [p. 11] and in Bṛhaspativākyam. These perhaps stand for the transitional stage through which ceyyollā changed to ceyyallē.

(iii) ചെയ്യവേണ്ടാ ceyya vēṇḍā, contracted to ചെയ്യേണ്ടാ ceyyēṇḍā, is quite common.

Forms like വൈകാതവേണ്ടും vaigāda vēṇdum [ഠS, 1, 109], പിഴചെയ്യായ്കവേണ്ടും piḻa ceyyyāga vēṇḍum [RC, 322] and ഓർക്കണ്ടാതെ ōṛkkaṇḍāde [KG. Gōvardh., l. 270] went out of use even in the Old Mal. period.

(iv) ചെയ്യരുതു ceyyarudu acquired its meaning of 'prohibition' from an early period in Mal. [See, ch. IV § 1, 2 (b).]. It is an indispensable 'prohibitive' in modern Mal. colloquial.

(v) A number of other collocations originally denoting 'inability' or 'impossibility' have come to acquire the signification of 'prohibition' in present-day Mal. in which both meanings occur according to the context.

ചെയ്തുകൂടാ ceydu kūḍā [corresponding to Tam. ceyya-k-kūḍādu; for the Mal. use of ceydu instead of ceyya, see §7] is used in the old texts only with the meaning of 'inability', 'incapacity' or 'impossibility', as in വചിച്ചുകൂടാ vaciccu kūḍā [KG, Pūt., l. 93], കണ്ടുകൂടാ kaṇḍu kūḍā [Kaly., 27], വാഴ്ത്തിക്കൂടാ vāḻttik-kūḍā [Rām. camp.], ചൊല്ലിക്കൂടാ colli-k-kūḍā [Eḻ Bh]. This collocation, however, besides being employed in the older sense, has come to be used sometimes as a prohibitive also: വരുത്തിക്കൂടാ എന്നു കല്പിച്ചിരിക്കുന്നു varutti-k-kūḍā [KU, p. 31].

Another similar construction which originally had the signification of 'incapacity', 'inability' or 'impossibility' but

which in some contexts today means 'prohibition' (though n others, it also has the older meaning) is constituted of the infinitive participle and the aorist negative vayyā [<vahi-y-ā, the base being an adaptation from Skt. vah- in a "generalised" sense.] The "generalised" meaning appears in old instances like the following:—

നടക്കവഹിയാഞ്ഞു വയോധികന്മാരും n'aḍakka vahiyāññu [VR, p. 79]; എണ്ടിശയിലും വഹിയാഞ്ഞു് eṇḍiśayilum vahiyāññu [Tuḷḷ, p. 627]; വയ്യാതുള്ളൊരു ദുഷ്ടകാഴ്ചം vayyāduḷḷoru [Tuḷḷ, p, 372].

ചെയ്യാൻമേലാ ceyyān mēlā is a type occuring today in Travancore colloquials with the signification of 'inability' and sometimes also that of 'prohibition'. I have not been able to find instances in the texts before the 17th century:— അങ്ങു വരാൻ മേലാ varān mēla [VR, p. 260] 'inability'; അനങ്ങാൻ മേലാഞ്ഞു് anaṅṅān mēlāññu [Tuḷḷ.,p. 238]; അനക്കാൻമേലാതെ anakkān mēlāde [ib., p. 242]; നടപ്പാനും മേലാത്ത n'aḍappānum mēlātta [Sabhāpr., l. 709].

I consider that this type perhaps owes its origin to juxtapositions like varuvānum-ēlā, which collocations popular etymology may have converted to varuvān mēlā, whereby mēlā was isolated.

ēlā, the aoristic negative of ēl-, appears in old texts frequently:—ഏലാ ēlā [KR, Sund., 194]; പലക്കും ഏലാ ഇതു palaṛkkum ēlā idu [Eḷ Bh]; അവൻ ഒന്നും ഏലായ്കകൊണ്ടു് avan on'n'um ēlāyga-koṇḍu [Bhāg. p. 79].

(vi) The Tamil singular prohibitive type ceyyādē 'do not thou do' appears to have been used by Old Mal. authors. Perhaps it was not universal in Malabar, as it has died out today except in south-eastern taluks of Travancore, where the influence of Tamil is still very strong:—

collāde [Eḷ Bh.]; ākkollādē [KG, Rugm, l. 298], tyajikkollādē [BhBh].

5. The following types of negatives are no longer current today:—

(i) മുറിപ്പടാമല്ല muṛippadāmalla [RC, 757]
സാധിക്കാമല്ല sādhikkām-alla [Kaly, 51]
പുകഴ്ത്താമല്ല pugaḷttāmalla [Rām camp.]
അടക്കാമല്ല aḍakkāmalla [ib.]
ആക്രമിക്കാമല്ല ākṛamikkāmalla [Eḷ Bh, p. 359]

(ii) Participial nouns with -alla:—

ഞാൻ പൂകുന്നോനല്ല ñān pūgun'n'ōn-alla [KG, Rugm, 1066]

ചീന്തുന്നോളല്ല cīndun'n'ōḷalla, ചെല്ലുന്നൂതല്ല cellun'n'ūd-alla [KG].

കൂടുന്നോനല്ല kūḍun'n'ōn'alla [Eḷ Cint., p. 22]

ചെയ്യുന്നോനല്ല ceyyun'n'ōnalla [ib.]

(iii) കാണുന്നൂവല്ല kāṇun'n'ū-v-alla [BhBh, 1, p. 102]

ചെയ്യുന്നുവല്ലെങ്കിൽ ceyyun'n'u-v-alleṅgil [BhBh.]

(iv) അറിയാമൽ ariyāmal [KR, Kiṣk, 151] അല്ലാൽ allāl [KR, KBhr, BhG], ചെയ്യാവിടിൽ ceyyā-viḍil are Tamilisms used by Kaṇṇaśśan.

6. The negative relative participle with -ā, already occurring in Tamil, is met with in compounds:—

ആകുലമിലാ നൃപതി ākulam-ilā nṛpāti [K Bhr, p. 107], എല്ലയിലാ ഗുണം ellayilā guṇam [KR, Utt.], ചാകാച്ചാവു cāgā-c-cāvu [Rām-camp., Sitāpaı, 64]; today, this form occurs only in proverbs and in a few compounds: —മിണ്ടാപ്പൂച്ച miṇḍā-p-pūcca [MP, No. 665]; ഇഷ്ടമല്ലാപ്പെണ്ണു iṣṭāmallāppeṇṇu [MP, No. 151]; നേടാപ്പൊൻ nēḍāppon [MP, No. 478]; ആടാച്ചാക്ക്യാർ āḍāccākkyār [MP, No 84]; ഉപ്പില്ലാപ്പത്ഥ്യം uppillāppathyam; കമ്പിയില്ലാക്കമ്പി kambiyillāk-kambi.

7. Among negative participial nouns, I must single out here for special mention the type varāttu [< varāttadu] which, though absent as such in Old Mal., appears in early New Mal. from about the period of VR :—പേടിയാത്തു pēḍiyāttu [VR, p. 204]; ദുഃഖമില്ലാത്തു duhkamillāttu [Girij., p. 57]; പോരാത്തു pōrāttu [ib., p. 73]; കൃപയില്ലാത്തു kṛpayillāttu [Tuḷḷ.]

CHAPTER V.

MISCELLANEOUS MAL: FORMATIONS

1. ഓളം ōḷam.

This form is used in Mal. for denoting 'limit' after the future relative participles and other words. Its history is traceable in Mal. itself.

The early Middle Tam. aḷavu denoting 'limit,' as in ucci aḷavu [Tēvāram], etc. was employed as aḷav-um (with the samuccaya -um) very commonly in the inscriptions, in RC and in the works of the Paṇikkars to denote 'limit':- അവന്നു പണ്ണ മളവനാളം paṇṇumaḷəvu [TAS, II, p. 194—10th c.]; പൂരാടം ഉ ടഞ്ഞി ഓണത്തളവും ōṇatt-aḷavum [TAS, II, p. 47—10th c.]; വരു മളവും varum-aḷavum [KR, Bāl., 123]; ആമളവും ām-aḷavum; ഇൻറള വും ind'-aḷavum [KBhr, p. 144]; പൂമള വും pūm-aḷavum [RC, 224]; നിശിചരപുരിയളവും n'iśicarapuri-y- aḷavum [RC 97].

The exact origin of aḷavum was lost sight of; forms with -aḷam were perhaps formed on the basis of the feeling that- vum (of aḷavum) stood for -m-um—as in maravum from maram-um. These forms with-aḷam also exist in RC and in the works of the Paṇikkars:— വേണ്ടുമളം vēṇḍum-aḷam [KR, Sund.]; ആമളം āmaḷam [RC, 86 · < āgum-aḷam]; അന്നളം an'n'aḷam [KR, Utt.]; കൂറരുതാതളം kūṟarudādaḷam [ib., 258].

The -m- of the constructions with the future rel. participles appears also reduced to the bilabial fricative in other instances in the same texts :- ആവളവും āvaḷavum [KR, Ār., 109]; and the -va- so formed appears to have been modified as vō (cf. avan > colloq. ōn):- തളരുവോളവും taḷaruvōḷavum [RC, 307], ആവോളവും āvōḷavum [KG, Rugm., l. 114]. KR, Ār. has also ആമോളം ഉരഗ ഞരം āmōḷam.

The form, thus isolated as ōḷam, was used later analogically in connection with other words and forms, as in ഇന്നയോളം in'n'a-y-ōḷam, കേട്ടോളം kēṭṭōḷam [the type of the past rel. participle followed by ōḷam does not exist before KG], vīṭṭ-in-ōḷam, attṟat-t-ōḷam, in'n'ale-y-ōḷam etc. VR., p. 352, has even എന്നെ ജിവാൻഗാ മിക്കുവോളത്തിനും gamikkuvōḷatti-num, where the augment -att- and the directive fourth case ending -in have been embodied.

2. എന്നിയേ En'n'IYĒ

From about the time of BhBh and the campus, Mal. has the forms എന്നിയേ eṅṅiyē, എന്റെ eṅye signifying 'without'. • In the older texts this appears as ind'i or iṅṅi which corresponds to the Tam. conj. participle of il- when il is regarded as a verb base. Since KR and other early texts have iṅṅi or ind'i [1] [ദീനതഇന്നി dīnata iṅṅi, KR, Ār., 55], the form en'n'iyē [BhBh, I, p. 97] and en'yē are developments of original in'n'i-y-ē with a dissimilative change of initial i to e.

3. മതി MADI

Mal. uses madi to express the idea of 'enough'. mati in Skt. means 'mind', 'understanding, etc.; and as a loan in Mal. [and in Tam.] it has the meanings 'estimate, extent', as in vila madi-kk- 'to estimate the price', irakku-madi, etc.

The process whereby the term came to mean 'enough' in Mal. is made clear by the use in the old texts of madi varum [cf. Ēkādesimāhā., I, 2, 4] and madi pōrum 'enough' <'estimated desire will reach fulfilment' [KR, Ār., 55]. Even Eḷ uses it in Bh. in കൃഷ്ണാ മതിപോരും നിന്നുടെ വീര്യങ്ങൾ madi pōrum n'innuḍe vīryaṅṅaḷ. cf. also madi āgum. āgum, varum and pōrum [which last form does duty for 'enough' in Tam. colloquial (Middle Tam. pōd- and pōr 'to go, reach' 'to be sufficient', derived from Old Tam. pō-tar- 'to go, reach, etc.') and is occasionally employed in Mal. texts also (cf. Rām. camp., Udyān., 55)] were dropped, and madi alone has come to mean 'enough' in Mal. Pūndānam has madi pōrāññ- in Santānagō. [Pāṭṭ.,p. 126]; but since madi by itself occurs with the meaning of 'enough' in the earliest Old Mal. texts, the occasional use of madi pōrum by Eḷ. and of madi pōrāññ- by Pūndānam is certainly "archaic". മതിയുണ്ട് madi-y-uṇḍu also exists in Old Mal. [Rām. camp., Tāḍ., 30].

4 ETṞA, ATṞA, ITṞA

എത്ര etra (how much), ഇത്ര itra (this much), അത്ര atra are Mal. forms that have been current in the west coast from the period of the earliest texts. Both Gundert and KP explain them as being constituted of the demonstratives [and the interrogative

1 A form and'i appears in some of the editions of the works of the Paṇikkars; this corresponds to Tam. அன்றி, the conj. past participle of al (when al is treated as a verb here).

e] and tira. This word tira, so far as I can see, occurs nowhere in the texts with the meaning 'quantity or measure'; nor do the meanings of Tam. tirai justify the postulate that tira is at the back of atṛa, itṛa [1].

The fact that the Niraṇam Paṇikkars [who, be it noted here, did use Tamilisms] use only അത്തന attana, ഇത്തന ittana, എത്തന ettana in their writings for atṛa, itṛa, etṛa might be noted here. Cf. also എത്തിനയും ettinayum in a citation from an Old Mal. poem in L, 4, 2, comm., and എത്തനക്കാലമുണ്ടു ettana-k-kālam-uṇḍu in an extract in L, 4, 22, comm..

5. ഒരിക്കൽ ORIKKAL

Mal. orikkal is normally descended from the stage represented by Middle Tam. oru-k-kāl.

The older forms in Mal. are the following ഒരുക്കൽ orukkal [TAS, VII, p. 113—early 13th c;]; orikkāl used in RC, 13; in KBhāg., p. 256; in US [2, 94]; in Līl. [cit.] 4, 2 and 4, 15; in Rām. camp., Udy., 59.

The change of u to i is supported by instances like Mal. irikk-[Tam. iru-kk-], pōriga [Tam. pōr-u-ga], orikkōl [Tam. oru-k-kōl 'one "kōl" or measure], etc.

For the shortening of the vowel in kāl, cf. the locative postposition kal of Mal., normally going back to kāl.

6. THE CONDITIONAL TENSE FORMED OF THE PAST STEM AND ēN ē, ēN āYIRUn'n'U.

This conditional tense, a unique formation in Mal, is very common in the colloquials today. In the Cochin State (and in Malabar), it appears in instances like the following:—

ഞാൻ എടുത്തേനേ ñān eduttēnē 'I would have (or might have) taken' (if something had happened); എടുത്തേനായിരുന്നു edut-tēnāyirun'n u 'he might have taken'.

In certain regional colloquials of Travancore [cf. Mathen's Mal. Grammar, pp.164 and 165], the affix appears as -ēnam, as in എടുത്തേനം eduttēnam.

---

1 ഇത്തിരി ittiri 'very small quantity' of modern Mal. [occurring in the texts from about El's time, as in El Bh, p. 374] may have been a derivative of ഇത്ര.

I have found the following illustrations in the texts:—

അച്യുതൻ ദാനംചെയ്തേനേ acyutan dānam ceydēnē [Bh Bh, 2, p. 125.]

കൊണ്ടന്നു് ഹന്ത തന്നേനേ kondan'n'u tan'n'ēnē [Irupatt. Rām., 9, 27]

കുറവു ഭവിച്ചേനേ bhaviccēnē [Tuḷḷ, p. 92]

പോരായ്മകൊണ്ടു പേരായേനേ pērāyēnē [Tuḷḷ, p. 418]

എന്റെ ദാരിദ്ര്യം തീൎത്തയച്ചേനേ ayaccēnē [Kucēl. Vanji., l 559]

I have not been able to find instances of this tense-type in US, RC, KR, KBhr or in Eḷ.

Gundert [Gr., p. 283] suggests that the old infinitive participle ena of en- 'to say' may have yielded the affix in question. Gundert does not notice the Travancore colloquial -ēnam at all in his grammar.

With the materials available, it is difficult to say how far Gundert's suggestion of the origin of the affix approaches the truth. *A priori* one may conceivably postulate a connection between the affix and a form of en- used in a generalised sense; but the exact connection or the character of the ancestral verb-form cannot be determined with the materials now available.

The question becomes somewhat complicated by the existence of a peculiar form expressing the conditional tense-idea in KG:—നന്മണികൂടാതെ പോയെങ്കിൽ വന്നാനും n'anmaṇi kūḍāde pōyāgil van'n'ānum 'he would (certainly) have come, if he had not gone with the bright jewel' [KG, Syamant., l. 69] If this van'n'ānum is related to the conditional forms with ēnam or ēnē—which is a conceivable possibility [1][cf. the concessive affix -ānum and its variānt -ēnum- as in എന്നാനും eṅṅānum and എന്നേനും],——then Gundert's suggestion regarding the affix ēnē may have to be rejected. But KG offers only one instance[2] of the type of van'n'ānum with the conditional meaning, and I have been unable to locate any similar instance in any other Old Mal. text.

---

1. Viewed purely from the standpoint of phonetics, -ആനും and -ഏനും may originate in other ways also: cf. colloquial ഇല്ലാനും or ഇല്ലേനും from ഇല്ലതാനും.

2 KG uses other constructions to bring out the conditional idea:— യാചിച്ചു് നിന്നാകിൽ തന്നുളുംതാൻ [Kucel, l. 342], കാർമ്മുകിൽവൎണ്ണനെ കണ്ടന്നതാകിൽ എൻകാംക്ഷം എല്ലാമേ സാധിച്ചുളും [Saubhadr., l. 114]

7, THE PARTICLES e, ē, ō AND ā

e and ē

In writing, very often the long and the short sounds are mixed up ; but it is quite possible to differentiate the short e from the long one, with reference to the origin of each. The reason for the mixing-up of the long and the short sounds in Mss. is that very often the original short e was itself lengthened as the result of stress.

Short e

(a) The accusative e of Mal. is a short suffix, derived as it is from older -ai (or a palatal a, as some maintain). The shortness of this e is expressly pointed by Līl., 2, 11 commentary: dwitīyo yathā:—"ānaye',, "marattin e"; atra ekaro hraswah.

Similarly, the e of the Mal. genitive singular uḍe and nd'e should be singular in view of their origin. The source of these affixes is Middle Tam. uḍaiya which appears as uḍai also.

കുറെ kuṛe from kuṛaya [the latter occurs as such in Girij. and other works], colloquial പളെ paḷe from paḷaya, having short e, may be compared.

The accusative e, the final sound of the genitive uḍe and nd'e (as also the final short e of kuṛe) may, when stressed, appear lengthened; but,in origin, the e here is short.

(b) The old infinitive participles like ēṛe, vaḷare, aḍukke, pōle, kūḍe, etc. which are used in Mal with the force of different parts of speech [See Ch. IV, §7], have a final short e only. The final sound of these forms is derived from a short a which is the value given to it in Tamil [=colloquial Tam. ə]. This is proved by the fact that in the older works and in old Mss., the forms appear as ēṛa, vaḷara, pōla, etc.

This e may also appear lengthened under the influence of of semantic stress.

(c) Another original short e is the final of the following occurring as the first constituents of compounds:—paṇḍe [as in paṇḍe-k-kālam], tale-n'āḷ, piťťe, maťťe, which forms are to be derived respectively from paṇḍai, talai, piťťai and maťťai [cf. Tamil forms with -ai]. Here too, semantic stress may lead to the lengthening of e, as in maťťē-k-kāryam,paṇḍēdu, talēn'āḷ.

Cf. Mal. വരെ vare "till", പിന്നെ pinne, നാളെ n'āḷe with Tam. varai, pinnai, n'āḷai.

Long ē

(a) The qualificatory ē of the phrasal constructions having the locative endings il and ṅgal, is derived from the terminative expletive ē appearing after these and other endings (like അതിനാലെ adināle, etc.) in old Mal. texts. This ē is a long one. In Mss., however, the sound is sometimes represented short.

The ē of -attē, of the type of kōḻikkōṭṭē-s-sabha and of the rare genitival type of n'āṭṭāre, is (as already pointed out by me in Chap. I, § 10) analogical in origin.

The ē appearing after directives and "local" words like വടക്കേ vaḍakkē, അങ്ങേ aṅṅē, മേലേ mēlē, കീഴേ kīḻē, in origin, is "emphatic" ē corresponding to the teṟṟram ē of Tam. [N, 354]. Cf. (b) below.

(b) The emphatic ē [always long, though represented in Mss. and in print sometimes as a short sound], appearing in words like the following, corresponds to Tam. teṟṟram ē.

(i) After pronouns:—

അയാൾ തന്നേ ayāḷ tannē, ആരുമേ ഇല്ല ārumē illa, ഏതുമേ ēdumē.

(ii) After verb- forms:—അതൽചെയ്യേ ceyyē [RC], ചത്തുവേ cattuvē, ceyyollāyē [KG], കൊല്ലുമേ kollumē, ചെയ്യല്ലേ ceyyallē, ചെയ്യരുതേ ceyyarudē, ഒക്കവേ okkavē, പോലവേ pōlavē, എടുക്കണേ eḍukkaṇē [> eḍukkaṇamē], വന്നോട്ടേ van'n'ōṭṭē [permanently embodied].

(iii) After other words:—

ഇല്ലേ illē ഒട്ടുമേ oṭṭumē, എപ്പേരുമേ epperumē, അതേപ്രകാരം adē prakāram, ഒരേ കാര്യം orē kāryam, പലേ ആളുകൾ palē āḷugaḷ.

(iv) After words denoting "direction", as a result of which the ē has come to be associated sometimes with a "local" meaning in Mal.

മേലേ mēlē, മുമ്പേ mumbē, പിമ്പേ pimbē, പുറമേ puṟamē, അകമേ agamē [occurring in old texts], വഴിയേ vaḻiyē [both in Old and in New Mal.].

(c) A "disjunctive" or "restrictive" ē, connected with the "emphatic" ē occurs in the following; cf. Tam. pirinilai ē [TC, 257 and N, 354].

(i) After verb- forms:—

നടക്കുകയേ വേണ്ടൂ n'aḍakkugayē vēṇḍū, പോകേ ഉള്ളൂ pogē uḷḷū, ഓടിയാലേ വീഴുകയുള്ളൂ ōḍiyālē vīḻugayuḷḷū.

(ii) After other words:—

അതേ adē 'yes' [here ē is permanently embodied, as also in atṛē below, used with a specialised syntactic function], മാത്രമേ mātramē, അത്രയേ atṛayē and അത്രേ atṛē.

(d) The interrogative ē [Tam. vinā ē; N, 354] occurs in the following:—

വന്നില്ലേ ? van'n'illē

[The difference between this form and വന്നില്ലേ van'n'illē with the emphatic ē is brought out in speech by a difference in the intonation of the forms].

എന്തേ endē 'what' > "why', ആരേ ārē, വരികയേ varigayē or വരികേ varigē, കൂടേ kūḍē [< kūḍayē], പോരേ pōrē, വയ്യേ vayyē, വേണ്ടേ vēṇḍē, രാമനല്ലേ rāmanallē.

[These instances of negative questions, mentioned above, may appear (see below) with ō also, as വന്നില്ലയോ ? van'n'illa-y-ō, വേണ്ടയോ ? vēṇḍa-y-ō, etc-; but there exists a slight difference in connotation: the questions with ō imply greater certainty or expectation on the speaker's part about the happening of the action referred to. Van'n'illayō would, for instance, imply that the speaker expects somebody to have come; while van'n'illē need not always (though sometimes it may) convey this expectancy.]

അല്ലേ allē appears also as allī, and as allallī, alla-y-allī, ill-allī, illa-y-allī from a very early period in Old Mal.

(e) The vocative ē:—

ബാലേ bālē, രാജാവേ rājavē, ഉള്ളോയേ uḷḷōyē, ഉള്ളോവേ uḷḷōvē, ഏ ! ഇവിടെ വരിക ē! ivide variga, എന്താ ഹേ endā hē.

(f) The poetic expletive or pādapūraṇa ē:— The Niraṇam Paṇikkars employ this ē plentifully in Mal. വിളയാട്ടിനിയെന്നേ viḷayāṭṭ-ini-y- en'n'ē, ചെഞ്ചോരിയണിന്തേ cen-cōri-y-aṇindē, വരുന്നതു കണ്ടേ varun'n'adu kaṇḍē. Cf. the isai-niṛai ē of Tamil [N, 354].

(g) Interjectional ē:— എന്നേ ennē, അയ്യേ ! ayyē 'shame !', അമ്മേ ammē.

(h) Augment ē:— പത്തേകാൽ pattē kāl 'ten and one-fourths'

(i) Colloquial n'an'n'ē < n'an'n'āy

„ van'n'ē! < van'n'u vey 'come along'.

Sūtra 354 of Nannūl envisages for the literary Tamil ē the following syntactic functions:—Disjunction, question, terminative expletive, emphasis (or 'clearness'), poetic expletive and reckoning. All these except the last are represented in Mal. It may be noted that in Mal. (i) the activity of the interrogative is much greater than in Tam. [modern coll. Tam. more generally uses -ā !], (ii) the terminative expletive ē and the emphasis-denoting ē have been requisitioned as a qualificatory ē in phrasal units; (iii) the emphasis- denoting ē has almost assumed a "locative" value in vaḷiyē, puṟamē, etc.; and (iv) the mere terminative expletive ē is not frequent in modern Mal., though KG and other old texts use it very commonly [modern Tam. has it in vīṭṭilē. adinālē, etc.]

The particle. ō.

This is always long in Mal. This fact is adverted to by Līl. in the commentary on sūtra 1 of the third śilpa:— "pō" "ayyō" ityādau hraswasya o- kārasya prayogo na nyāyyah.

(a) Interrogative ō, very active in Mal.

വന്നുവോ? van'n'uvō, ഓടീട്ടോ? ōḍīṭṭō, ഇല്ലയോ illayō, അല്ലയോ allayō.

Affirmative tense-forms in Mal. use only ō for questions. Literary Tam. has the interrogative ō, but the modern colloquial has -ā, generally speaking.

(b) Closely connected with the above is the "doubt-denoting" ō of the following:—

ആരോ വന്നു ārō van'n'u, ആവോ āvō, എന്തോപറഞ്ഞു endō paṟaññu, എട്ടോ ഒമ്പതോ eṭṭō onbadō, ഓടീട്ടോ ചാടീട്ടോ കാൽ ഒടിഞ്ഞു ōḍīṭṭō cāḍīṭṭō kāl odiññu.

In expressions like ñān āṇō van'n'adu? with a particular intonation, a negative meaning is implied. Tam. [TC 256, N, 355] classifies the meaning separately as edirmaṟai.

(c) In constructions like യാതൊരുത്തൻ അതു ചെയ്തുവോ അവൻ... .yādoruttan adu ceyduvō, avan. . . .

(d) പോകയോ നീ pōgayō [KG, Vēṇ., l. 112] has the force of a polite imperative; such optative forms with ō

occur in other chapters of KG [e. g., Gōp., 2, l. 127] and in Rām. camp.

(e)• -allō, in the following, conveys the "certainty" of the speaker in such a way as to induce the person spoken to, to share the same degree of certainty about it: പോയല്ലോ pōyallō, allā-y-allō, all-allō.

allayō is different from allō in that the former sometimes implies a doubt or a question, which the latter does not•

വന്നില്ലല്ലോ van'n'illallō 'he certainly did not come'; മാനുഷജന്മം എടുത്തതുകൊണ്ടാണല്ലോ അയാൾ മരിച്ചതു mānuṣajanmam eḍu-ttadu koṇḍ-āṇallō ayāḷ mariccadu; രാമൻ അല്ലല്ലോ rāman allallō.

(f) In the following, ō distinguishes a particular aspect from the others:—

ഊണോ അയാൾക്കില്ല ūṇō ayāḷkilla, ഓടിയാലോ വീഴും ōḍiyālo vīḻum.

(g) ō is in some areas heard in Mal. today as a vocative particle, though this is not perhaps universal.

നാരായണോ n'ārāyaṇō, ശങ്കരോ śaṅkarō; eḍō, of course, is characteristically Mal.

(h) Interjectional ō:—അച്ചോ accō, അയ്യോ ayyō.

(i) Colloquial വന്നോ van'n'ō > van'n'u koḷ; East Mal. ഓ ō 'yes'.

The particle ā.

(a) In questions conveying 'doubt':—

ചാക്കയാ cakkayā, വീട്ടിലേക്കാ vīṭṭilēkkā, കുളിക്കാനാ kuḷik-kānā, മുറിഞ്ഞതു വീണിട്ടാ muṟiññadu vīṇiṭṭā, പോകയാ pōgayā, ഇപ്പോൾ വന്നതാ ippōḷ van'n'adā.

In colloquial expressions like അവൻ ആ ഓടുന്നു avan ā ōḍun'n'u, ā is perhaps the demonstrative itself.

(b) In vocatives:—എടാ eḍā, രാമാ rāmā.

(c) Exclamatory: അതാ adā, ഇതാ idā.

(d)˙ The polite imperatives with -ga,-kka have in some old texts [cf. Eḻ Cint.] a long ā as final, on account of stress:— അറികാ aṟigā, ചൊൽകാ colga [Sabhā,, l. 444]•

(e) For the neg. suffix ā of Mal., see above•

(f) In some Mss. of RC, the old infinitive participle with a, is written sometimes with a long-ā:—ഉടമ്പു വകയ്ന്തു നീളാ nīḷā [650], തുമിത്തിരതനയൻ ചൊല്ലാ collā [672], etc.

CHAPTER VI.

THE LANGUAGE OF SOME MAL. CLASSICS.

I. THE MORPHOLOGY OF Uṇṇun'īlīsandeśam.

Inflexions.

1. The use of samskṛtīkṛta bhāṣā forms like mādambīnām, uṇṇun'īlīm vērirun'n'u, etc.

2. The rather rare use of nd'e, the singular gentive; there are only three instances in the text.

3. eññaḷ-, as the "oblique" form; ñaññaḷ is non-existent.

4. The inflexional stem of the neuter plural ava appears as avayiṫṫ-.

5. The use of the comparisonal kāḷ with the locative, as in paṇḍēdil-k-kāḷ beside normal paṇḍēdine-k-kāḷ [with acc.].

6. The rarity of instances with the qualificatory ē.

Verbs.

1. Old bases like vel-, kuṛikkoḷ-, uḻar-, tēṛ, etc.

2. Older forms of val-, en-.

3. Arudu is used exclusively in the older sense.

4. Present tense ending appears as ind'-.

5. The presence of personal endings for tense-forms, beside those without such endings.

6. Second personal sing. tense-forms without y of the personal ending, as in māṫṫinā, vend'ā, etc.

7. The Tamil type ceyyalām beside Mal. ceyyām,

8. The use of the um-tense for third personal rational plural forms.

9. The ū-tense in the imperative kēḷpū.

10. Optatives like velvūd-āga.

11. Constructions like colvuṇḍu.

12. Negative tense-inflected forms like aṛiyāyind'idu, allāññu etc.

13. The frequent use of the older infinitive participle.

14. Orikkāl [later Mal. orikkal].

2. CHIEF MORPHOLOGICAL PECULIARITIES OF THE LANGUAGE OF THE Niraṇam Paṇikkars.

A. Tamilisms.

A number of features in the works of the Paṇikkars appear to be far more Tamilistic than is warranted by the development of Mal. during their time. Some of these may have been used out of deference to the Tam. literary tradition, while others may have been regionally current in parts of Travancore at that time.

The test that I have applied to find out whether a particular feature was a Tamilism or not during the period of these writers [viz. late fourteenth century] is to examine whether the feature concerned is employed frequently in (i) US which chronologically preceded KR, KBhr and KBhāg, etc. (ii) Līl., the commentary on which was composed about the 14th century; and (iii) those early west coast inscriptions in which characteristic Mal. features are conspicuous.

The application of this test reveals the following linguistic features to be Tamilisms. I have confined my observations to Rāma Paṇikkar's works alone; but what I say of Rāma Paṇikkar's works would be true of the language of the other Niraṇam Paṇikkars.

Inflexions:—The dominant use of the sixth case ending uḍaya, of എല്ലീരും ellīrum [KR, Kiṣk., 258], of avayaṯṟ-, etc.

Verbs:—1. Bases of forms like pugan'n'ān 'said', pēṇ-i-' iyambinān 'spoke', migunda, viṇḍ- 'having split into parts', mīḷvadu 'what returns', etc.

2. Personal endings ōm, īr, ana for the affirmative tense-forms; and personal terminations (wherever they exist) for all aorist negatives.

The use of the so-called cāriyai- an- in the past tense forms of the type of pugund-an-an, uratt-an-an, etc.

3. The present tense with ā-n'ind'- [or as modified into āy-n'ind'-].

4. Past stems like pugaḷnd, aṟind-, etc.

5. Rel. participles like pōna, āna.

6. "Neuter" participals like n'ilpanavum n'aḍappanavum n'aḍuññi [KR, Kiṣk., 78]

7. Imperatives like pāṛāy [sing.], kāṇā(y) [sing.]; kāṇīr [plural].

8. Optatives like varuvōy-āga, aṛivōy-āga, ceyvōy-āga.

9. Negative participles with-āmal, as in ceyyāmal, etc.

10. Neg. conditionals like ceyyāviḍil, allāl.

12. Forms like aṛiyādapaḍi, varum-baḍi, ceyda-paḍi.

13. Miscellaneous:—(i) Old compounds like cey-tavam, vaḷar kumbhakaṛṇan, n'anneṛicēr-irāman, eila-y- illāguṇavān, etc,; (ii) ettana, attana, ittana; (iii) anattu; (iv) and'i.

B. Characteristic Old Mal. features in NIRAṆAM works.

Inflexions:—The incorporation of the dorsal glide in words like rājāvu, guruvu, bhāryāvu, etc.; the use of āy for the third case as in tampiyum-āyē; the use of directive forms like dikkinu pōyān [modern dikkilēkku pōy], amarulaginu celvan.

Pronouns: eññaḷ- as "oblique" base; ñāññaḷ both as nominative and as an "oblique" base; tām, tammōḍu, etc.

Verbs:—1. Bases like peḍukk-, tāḷkk-, vaḷaṛkk.

2. The present tense with- in'n'-, the intermediate stage through which Middle Tamil -g-ind'- changed to Mal. -un'n'-.

3. The past stem eḻun'in n'-.

3. Negative tense-inflected forms, beside negatives with illa.

4. Neg. relative participles with -ā and -āda [without the geminated surd -tt-].

5. Miscellaneous:—(i) വരുമളവു varumaḷavum, വരുമളം varumaḷam, containing the "ancestral" form of -ഓളം -ōḷam.

(ii) മതിപോരും madi pōrum beside madi.

(iii) ind'i and in'n'i (later Mal. en'n'i).

(iv) the "iśainiṛai" ē.

[The kāṇām type; the verbal nouns with -ga, - kka; the um future for third personal "rationals"; tense-forms without personal endings (with and without the expletive -idu); the polite imperatives of the types of variga and van'n'ālum, are features which already exist in the works of the Paṇikkars].

C. Some chiel Mal. features not met with in Niraṇam works.

1. Sing. genitive ending (n)d'e. 2. Directives like adilēkkŭ, n'ilattēkku, etc. 3. Phrasal units of the type of kāṭṭilē āna. 4. Future with ū is very rare. 5. -um future for the first person. 6. -vān as in endu-vān.

3 CAMPU MAL.

Inflections.

1. While śuddhasamskṛta (not only as isolated words, phrases or even as sentences but often exclusively in complete verses) and bhāṣīkṛta-samskṛta [1] are everywhere common, the samskṛtīkṛta bhāṣā forms such as are met with in some of the works of the earlier maṇipravāḷa period [like US] are absent.[2]

2. The writers of the great campus show themselves to be adepts alike in composing the most complicated Sanskrit prose and in regaling the reader with the most appealing Malayāḷam. Some of the gadya passages in Mal. move like cascades and waterfalls. Often they are rich in colloquial expressions; and in a few, the pure "Doric" of the mass-speech is employed.

Some instances of "corruptions" of Skt. forms in the colloquial of the period are the following;—

തെണ്ണിപ്പു teṇṇippu [Skt. daṇḍa], തിവദം tivadam [Skt. divasa], പ്രാമ്മർ prāmmar [Skt. brāhmaṇa] in Rām. camp., Vicch.; പലിക്ക palikka [denom. verb from Skt. phala]; പാക്യം pākyam [Skt. bhāgya], തവശിഗൾ tavaśigaḷ [Skt. tapaswin], കണവതിഹോമം kaṇavati hōmam [Skt. gaṇapati homa] in Rām. camp. Aśwam.; പ്രമത്തൻ pramattan [Skt. brahmadatta], വെലി veli [Skt. bali] in ib., Sitāsway; കെർപ്പം kerppam [Skt. garbha] in ib., Rāmav.,

1 Compounds of Sanskrit and bhasa words occur in the campus. The principle of forming word-compounds with Skt and Mal constituents has existed in Mal. from the earliest times. Many such compounds have been assimilated by Mal. Cf. L., III, 29, commentary. But instances like നാരീകന്നാരുള്ളതെന്നു [Ram. camp., Asvam., g.], and ഭൂതൻഗുണന്നാ are certainly remarkable.

2. Candrotsavam, a manipravala work composed certainly after Punam had written his Ram. camp., contains however a few rare instances of native words with Sanskrit endings,—വെപോടിഭി: [4, 7], വിളക്കമാടന്യ [3, 129]

gadya 10; വക്കാണിച്ചു vakkāṇiccu [1] 'explained' [Skt. vyākhyāna] in ib., Kharav., അക്ക്യോത്രം akkyōtram [Skt. agnihotra] in ib., കിരിഴി kiriḻi [Skt. kṛṣi], in b. Aṅg.

Some instances of native words current in the mass-colloquial of the period:—മുണുഞ്ഞി muṇuññi for viḻuññi; ഉമിഞ്ഞു umiññu for umiṇṇu, കുപ്പനാട് kuppan'āḍu for 'house' in ācāra bhāṣā; പറമ്മേൽ parammēl for parambinmēl.

3. Among the postpositions, the following old ones may be noted:—ആയ്ക്കൊണ്ട് āy-k-koṇḍu is used not only for 'purpose' as in പോരിനായ്ക്കൊണ്ട് പുറപ്പെട്ട pōrināykkoṇḍu puṛappeṭṭa [Rām. camp., Bālivadh., 28], but also for the simple datival idea as in ജ്യേഷ്ഠനായ്ക്കൊണ്ട് ദത്വാ jyēṣṭhanāy-k-koṇḍu datwā [ib., Udyān, gadya], and even for the "communicative" case, as in അവനോടായ്ക്കൊണ്ട് പറഞ്ഞു avanōḍ-āy-k-koṇḍu paraññu.

പോക്കൽ pōkkal [which occurs in BhBh, and later in Eḻ and in Cāṇakky.] occurs in the campus [e.g., Rām. camp., Aṅg.].

-ഏൽ-ēl [<mēl], restricted to regional colloquials today, in പുഷ്പകവിമാനത്തേൽ puṣpakavimānattēl [ib., Udy., 34], പറമ്മേൽ parammēl [ib., Aṅg., 6].

തൊട്ട് toṭṭu [with the force of പറ്റി pat't'i or കുറിച്ച് kuṛiccu], in ഞങ്ങളെത്തൊട്ട് തേ മനസേ കോപമുണ്ടാകിൽ ñaṅṅaḷe toṭṭu [ib., Bālivadh., gadya 6.].

4. Old plurals like പാമ്പന്മാർ pāmbanmār [Gajēndr.], മകളർ magaḷar [Naiṣ. camp., 13], നാലർ nālar, എണ്മർ eṇmar, etc.

5. Instances with the comparisonal കാൾ kāḷ, like the following are peculiar:—മുടികയിലേക്കാൾ muḍigayilē-k kāḷ [Rām. camp., Swarg., gadya.]; മുന്നേക്കാൾ munnē-k-kāḷ [ib., Khar., 65]; ഇതിൽക്കാൾ idil-k-kāḷ [Naiṣ. camp.], ഇതേക്കാൾ idē-k-kāḷ [ib.].

6. എല്ലായിലും ellāyilum, without the augment, is common. പലവും palavum, ചിലവു cilavu [=cilava] also occur.

7. The oblique എങ്ങൾ eṅṅaḷ- is occasionally met with in the campus.

---

1. വക്കാണിക്ക് has also suffered a pejoration of meaning in some contexts [Cf. KG ദൌജന്യം, l. 310]. This form and some others in the above list may have been Pkt.-derived: cf. L, II, 4, comm.

8. Sanskrit constructions often appear side by side with Malayāḷam ones in the same sentence. This has led to the adoption sometimes in the Malayāḷam portion of certain unique Sanskrit syntactic usages.

(i) Sanskrit "casal" concord:—

രാമനെ വേറിരുന്നാൽ rāmane vēṟirun'n'āl [Rām. camp., Vicch., 54].

വേഗാൽ പുറപ്പെട്ടു് vēgāl puṟappeṭṭu [ib., Ayōdhyā.].

രാമാൽ ഭയപ്പെടുക കൊണ്ടു ramāl bhayappeḍuga-koṇḍu [ib., Sugr.].

യാത്രാം മുതിൎന്നീടിനാൻ yātrām mudiṟn'n'īḍinān [Kalyāṇ., 32.]

In the last-mentioned instances, Sanskrit case-endings themselves are used. The use of Sanskrit inflexional concord in Malayāḷam instances is, however, comparatively rare.

Instances like ജ്യേഷ്ഠനായ്ക്കൊണ്ടു് ദത്വാ jyēṣṭhanāykkoṇḍu datwā [Rām. camp., Udy., gadya] where āykkoṇḍu is pleonastic may have been influenced by Sanskrit "purpose" constructions with postpositions distinguishing the idea of "purpose".

(ii) Sanskrit "concord" between viśeṣaṇa and viśeṣya is imitated in Malayāḷam constructions. This is more frequent[1] than (i) above.

സുന്ദരിയോടു് സീതയോടു് sundariyōḍu sītayōḍu

[In Malayāḷam (and south Dr. speeches generally) the construction should be sundari-y-āya sītayōḍu].

---

1. Instances of this type occur commonly in Bh Bh:—

രാമകൃഷ്ണന്മാർ രണ്ടു വസ്ത്രങ്ങളെ ധരിച്ചോർ തങ്ങൾക്കിഷ്ടപ്പെട്ടിരിക്കുന്നവയെ [2, p. 22].

ഇരുന്നൂറു ചേടികളേയും കൊടുത്താൻ വസ്ത്രാഭരണഭൂഷിതന്മാരായവരെ [1, p. 3]

This "concord" is very rare before the campu period; അംബികാം മണവാളനെ അഖിലേശനെ [KR, Bāl., 238] is, however, a rare instance from the works of the Panikkars.

After the campu period, this concord was equally rare, but cf. Uṇṇāyis' ശ്രീനായകനെ നീ ഭജ മൂഢനെ [Naḷ. Āṭṭ.].

നിതിജ്ഞനോട് സുമന്ത്രനോട് n'ītijñanōḍu sumantranōḍu
[Rām. camp., Vicch, 53].

വത്സനെ രാമം valsane rāmam [ib., 67—Here, the Skt. accusative ending is used for the viśeṣya].

ദേവന്നു അക്കോസലേന്ദ്രന്നു dēvannu akkōsalēndrannu [ib., Sugr., 46].

രണ്ടാം മഹേന്ദ്രന്നു നളന്നു raṇḍām mahēndrannu n'aḷannu [Naiṣ-camp., 2, 7]

(iii) Other Sanskrit constructions.

നിന്നാൽ ഗീയതേ n'innāl gīyate [Naiṣ. camp., 2, 97].

നിന്നാൽ അനുശ്രൂയതാം n'innāl anuśruyatām [Rām. camp. Rāvaṇōdh, 70]

നിന്നോട് മമ പരവാൻ വേല ഉണ്ടെങ്കിലും n'innōḍu mama paravān... [Bālivadh.]

ശോകമേ മമ വരൂ śōkamē mama varū [Naiṣ. camp.]

Verbs.

1. The older forms val-, en- and uḷ-:—

വല്ലാതെ vallāde 'not being able'	ഉളൻ uḷan
വല്ലീല vallīla	ഉളർ uḷar, ഉള uḷa
വല്ലേൻ vallēn	ഉളോൻ uḷōn
	എന്നു en'n'ū 'said'

2. അരുതു arudu employed with the older signification:—

പുകഴരുതു് ഓർത്താൽ pugaḷarud-ōrttāl 'impossible to praise sufficiently' [Rām. camp. Vicch.]

പുകഴ്ത്തീടരുതു pugaḷttīḍarud-[Kalyāṇ. gadya]

അരുതായ്കിൽ arudāygil, അരുതാഞ്ഞു arudāññu, അരുതാതോളം arudādōḷam, അരുതായുന്നു arudāyun'n'u are older verb forms based on arudu.

3. Old bases like the following:—

ഇയല് iyal-	കരേറ karēr-
ഉഴൽ uḷal-	പുലമ്പ് pulamb- 'to appear'
തിമിർക്ക timir-kk-	കിടൈക്ക kiḍai-kk-
പിഴുക് piḷug-	ചുവട്ട് cuvatt-
തഴുക് taḷug-	വളർക്ക vaḷar-kk-
മാഴ്ക് māḷg-	അമർക്ക amar-kk-

നിറൈക്ക് n'irai-kk-
ഇകഴ് igaḻ-
മകിഴ് magiḻ-
പുകഴ് pugaḻ-
കുറിക്കൊള്ള് kuṟi-k-koḷ-
ഉൾച്ചേര് uḷ-c-cēr-
ചെവിക്കൊള്ള് cevi-k-koḷ-
ചെവിത്തറ് cevi-t-tar-

ആയ് āy- 'to attempt'
ഓര് ōr-
പെടുക്ക് peḍu-kk-
പൈക്ക് pai-kk-
മേളം താവ് mēḷam tāv-
മേളം മെത്ത് mēḷam mett-
കൈ മെയ മറക്ക് kai mey maṟakk-
ഇളകൊൾ iḷa-koḷ-

4. Personal endings for tense-forms occur in the padya portions occasionally, beside forms without tense-endings. The gadyas generally show forms without personal terminations, though instances like ചൊന്നേൻ connēn, എത്തുവൻ ettuvan, വൈപ്പൻ vaippan [gadya of Rām. camp., Sugr.] do also occur. The types of tense-forms with personal endings are the following :—

1st person singular past and 3rd person rational (sing. and pl.) past tense forms are fairly common with personal endings.

The second person sing. past and future forms show personal endings in rare instances—തുനിഞ്ഞായ് tuniññāy [Rām. camp., Udyān.,80], മുടിഞ്ഞായ് muḍiññāy [ib., 78], കൊണ്ടീടുവാ koṇḍīḍuvā (y) [with elision of final-y, in Rām. camp., Sugr., 8], മറന്നാ maṟan'n'ā(y)[ib., 65].

1st person sing. present tense and 1st person sing. future tense forms also occasionally show personal endings[1]

Among the negative aorist tense-forms, the following are met with:—വല്ലേൻ vallēn [1st person sing.], ആൾ പോരാദോ āḷ pōrādō [3rd person sing. irr.—Rām. camp., Rāmāva, 87], അറിയാർ aṟiyār [3rd person rational pl.— bi., Tāḍ., 47]. Except വല്ലേൻ vallēn frequently used in the old *cliches* colla vallen, paṟavān vallēn, etc. the other types of negatives with personal endings are very rare indeed; and the characteristic Mal. negatives without personal endings had of course become quite common.

---

1. Apart from the above types, affirmative tense-forms do not show personal terminations in the campus. There is little doubt that even these types with personal terminations, met with in the campus, had by this time become purely literary.

5. The aorist tense with ū is employed with all Old Mal: syntactic significations:—as an indeterminate tense, in instances like eññū, n'allū and even allū [Rām camp., Sitāpar., 72], in imperatives like irippū....aṟivū..vaippū.. kuḷippū,.. jīvippū [Rām. camp.. Paṭṭābh., 94], or in kaṇḍāvu, puṇarn'n'āvū [Naiṣ. camp. gadya, 1], and in restrictive conditional constructions.

ഓർക്കേണ്മൂ orkkēṇmū and വരേണ്മൂ varēṇmū are (as already pounted out by me) unique forms with ū in the campus.

6. Old past stems like cāṟn'n'-, kudaṟn'n'-, pugaṉṉ- beside pugaḷn'n'-, magiḷ-n'n'-, umiṉṉ- beside umiññ-, വീയി vīyi.

7. Old infinitive participles like the following:—

നടുങ്ങേ........കുലുങ്ങേ n'aḍuṅṅē........ kuluṅṅē [Kalyāṇ.], നിവിരച്ചൊല്ലി n'ivira-c-colli, കുലയ നടന്നു kulaya n'aḍan'n'u.

The verbal noun കാണ്ക kāṇga is employed with an infinitive participle force sometimes:— വാനോർ കാണ്കെ vānōr kāṇge... muḍiccu [Rām. camp-, Tāḍ., 25], നീ കാണ്കെത്തന്നെ ഞാൻ മരിപ്പൻ n'ī kāṇge-t-tanne ñān marippan [Rāvaṇavij.]

8. Participials used with the force of imperatives, like കണ്ടാവിതു kaṇḍāvidu, പുണർന്നാവിതു puṇarn'n'āvidu, മുകർന്നാവിതു mugarn'n'āvidu.

The singular imperative of the type of ചെയ്യാതെ ceyyāde, occurs in rare instances:— ഖേദിയാതെ khēdiyāde [Naiṣ. camp. 2, 31.

പോകയോ pōgayō [Udyān., 9] with a gentle imperative force.

9. The concessive with ഏനും ēnum is common in instances like ēdēnum, eññēnum, ārēnum.

The suffixal - വാൻ -vān denoting "doubt" occurs in Naiṣ. camp. in എന്തുവാൻ enduvān [1, 38].

10. Peculiar "relative participial" constructions പാരിച്ചൊ ചില പാറകളും pāricco cila pāṟagaḷum [Rām. camp., Kharav., gadya]; കരഞ്ഞോ ചില പിള്ളകളും karaññō cila piḷḷagaḷum [ib.].

11. The occasional use of participial nouns like കൂട്ടൂതും kūṭṭūdum [Rām. camp., Sugr., 7], കാട്ടൂതും kāṭṭūdum [Kirātam, 58], beside normal എന്താവതു endāvadu, പറവതു paṟavadu, etc., and forms with -idu like കൈകാൽ ഇളക്കാവിതു kāi kāl iḷakkāvidu [Kalyāṇ., 27]

12. Negative tense-inflected forms of all types are met with in the campus.

13. The negative aorist with final -ā [for all persons already in Mal. before the period of the campus] is employed in connection with a larger number of words than today:—നാരായണൻ എന്നോടൊപ്പാ n'ārāyaṇan ennōḍ-oppā [Rāvaṇavij.], ഒവ്വാ ovvā [Rām. camp., Rāv.], പൊറാ poṟā [ib., Vicch], ഒവ്വാ ovvā.

14. Negative formations like പുകഴാമല്ല pugaḻāmalla [Rām. camp., Rāv.], മനസി പൊറായുന്നതില്ല manasi poṟāyun'n'adilla [ib., Sugr.], വാഴ്ത്താവതല്ല vāḻttāvadalla [ib., Sitāsway., gadya].

Miscellaneous

മതിയുണ്ടു് madi-y-uṇḍu [Rām. camp., Kharav., 87] beside madi; also പോരും pōrum 'enough' [ib.]; ഒരിക്കാൽ orikkāl [ib., beside orikkal.

4. PROMINENT OLD MAL. PECULIARITIES IN THE LANGUAGE OF KṛṣṇAGāTHA

1. Nominal bases:—മാൺപു māṇbu; ഓർച്ച ōṛcca; പട്ടാങ്ങു് paṭṭāṅṅu; നുറുങ്ങു് n'uṟuṅṅu; പുള്ളു് puḷḷu; ആച്ചിമാർ āccimār; ഓലക്കം ōlakkam; കോഴ kōḻa; തണ്മ taṇma; വായ്പു vāypu; അന്തിമയക്കു് andimayakku; ആനായർ ānāyar; വീഴ്പുകൾ vīḻpugal; പേ pē; കൂ 'kū (as in കൂ പറയുക kū paṟayuga); ചേവടിത്തെല്ലു് cēvaḍi-t-tellu 'the edge of the sacred feet;' അല്ലൽ allal; അത്തൽ attal; ഇടർ iḍar; ഇണ്ടൽ iṇḍal; ചായലാർ cayalār; ഉമ്പർകോൻ umbarkōn; വിണ്ണു് viṇṇu; മാനം mānam [vānam]; തിട്ടതി tiṭṭadi; ഓമൽ ōmal; പുള്ളു് puḷḷu.

Adaptations from Skt. (or Prakrit):—ഗോഷ്ഠി gōṣṭhi 'assemblage'; native കോട്ടി kōṭṭi sanskritized as gōṣṭhi 'pranks' also occurs in KG; ദീനം dīnam 'wretchedness' [not 'illness']; ശിക്ഷ śikṣa 'instruction' and 'punishment'; അങ്കി aṅgi; വാദ്ധ്യായൻ vāddhyāyan; സംസാരം samsāram (only 'worldliness'); ആഭാസൻ (with the modern meaning); വക്കാണം vakkāṇam (from Pkt; the meaning in KG is 'quarrel'); വാതം vādam 'wind'; സംഗതി saṅgati 'union'; പണ്ടാരം paṇḍāram; ശിക്ഷ śikṣa in ശിക്ഷയിൽ ഭിക്ഷ നൽകുവർ.

2. The second case:—(i) ദേശങ്ങൾ പിന്നിട്ടു് dēśaṅṅaḷ pinniṭṭ-; അമ്പാടി മുന്നിട്ടു് ambāḍi munniṭṭ—; ശീതത്തെ വേറിട്ടു് sīdatte vēṟiṭṭ-

(ii) വെളിയെത്തൊട്ടുള്ളോരുത്സവം vēḷiye-t-toṭṭuḷḷōr-ulsavam ; തമ്പുരാനെത്തൊട്ട് tamburāne-t-toṭṭ-; വെണ്ണയും പാലും തൊട്ടുള്ള കൊതി veṇṇayum pālum toṭṭ-

(iii) കൃഷ്ണനെക്കൊണ്ട് പറയുക kṛṣṇane-k-koṇḍu parayuga; എന്നതുകൊണ്ടുള്ള വാർത്ത en'n'adu koṇḍ-uḷḷa vārtta; etc.

3. The third case:— (i) ōḍ-āy- and ōḍ-āyiṭṭu in the "communicative":— കംസനോടായി ചൊന്നാൻ; താതനോടായിട്ട് ചൊല്ലിനാൻ tādanōḍāyiṭṭ-; മാതാവിനോടായിട്ട് ചൊല്ലി നിന്നിടിനോർ mādavinōḍ-āyiṭṭ-; etc.

(iii) ōḍ- in connection with separation:— കൈകേരോടുവേരാം മണികൾ kairōḍu vērām; പങ്കജം തന്നോടുവേർപെട്ട് paṅkajam tannōḍu vērpaṭṭ-.

4. The fourth case:—(i) -inu or -innu as the dative ending, in പാരിനും pārinum, മാലിന്ന് mālinnu, വേലിന്ന് vēlinnu; but പൈതൽക്ക് paidalkku, കുഴൽക്ക് kuḷalkku. etc.

(ii) āy and āyiṭṭ- to express the datival idea: ദേവകിക്കായിട്ട് നൽകിടിനാൻ dēvakikk-āy-iṭṭ-, സോദരന്നായ് കൊടുത്തു sōdarannāy, ആരണന്നായിട്ട് നൽകിനാർ āraṇann-āy-iṭṭu, കാട്ടാളനായിട്ട് കാഴ്ചയായ് നൽകിനാൻ kāṭṭāḷan-āyiṭṭu.

5. The directives:—(i) മേല്പട്ട് mēlpaṭṭu, കീഴ്പട്ട് kīḻpaṭṭu; forms with -ōttu like അങ്ങോട്ട് aṅṅōṭṭu, തെക്കോട്ട് tekkōṭṭu are rare in KG.

(ii) ആമ്മാറ് āmmāṟu has sometimes a directive force: വിണ്ണിലങ്ങാമ്മാറ് viṇṇil-aṅṅ-āmmāṟu, വാതില്ക്കലാമ്മാറ് vādilkkal-āmmāṟu, തേരിലങ്ങാമ്മാറ് teril-aṅṅ-ammāṟu.

(iii) നോക്കി n'ōkki frequently appears with a directive meaning: കാട് നോക്കി ചാടിനാർ kāḍu n'ōkki, കാന്താരം നോക്കി kāntāram n'ōkki, അങ്ങു നോക്കി aṅṅu n'ōkki, പിൻനോക്കി pin n'ōkki, ദ്വാരക നോക്കി dwāraka n'ōkki.

(iv) -innu, the dative ending, is used "directively" in കാലപുരത്തിന്ന് പുക്കു kālapurattinnu.

ēkk and il-ēkk or -iṅgal-ēkk do not appear in KG at all.

(v) Rarely āykkoṇḍu has a directive meaning: തേരിലങ്ങായ്ക്കൊണ്ട് പാഞ്ഞു tēril-aṅṅ-āykkoṇḍu.

6. The sixth case:— The use of the genitive instead of the dative (cf. Skt.) in ബാലകന്മാരുടെ ഹിംസ ചെയ്തു bālakanmāruḍe himsa ceydu, നിന്നുടെ ഹാനി വരാതെ n'innuḍe hāni varāde.

7. The seventh case:—(i) മുന്നമേ munnamē, തീരമേ കോടിനാർ tīramē, കൂട്ടമേ kūṭṭamē, അകമേ agamē.

(ii) ഇട iḍa as a postposition in കാലിട kāliḍa, മുന്നിട munniḍa, etc.

(iii) The frequent use of the "loose" postpositions ചാരത്തു cārattu, അണയത്തു aṇayattu, മുന്നൽ munnal.

8. The eighth case:—ഉള്ളോനേ uḷḷōnē, ഉള്ളോയേ uḷḷōyē and ഉള്ളോവേ uḷḷōvē:—

മാലേയച്ചാറണിയും മാറുള്ളോനേ uḷḷōnē
അനഘനായുള്ളോയേ uḷḷōyē
നിത്യനായുള്ളോവേ uḷḷōvē

9. Pronouns:—എങ്ങൾ eṅṅaḷ-as the inflexional stem of ഞങ്ങൾ ñāṅṅaḷ is very frequent in KG, beside ñaṅṅaḷ- itself.

(ii) eṅṅaḷ appears even as a nominative in എങ്ങൾ വസിക്കുന്നു eṅṅaḷ vasikkun'n'u, എങ്ങൾ മടിച്ചില്ലല്ലോ eṅṅaḷ maḍiccillallō, etc.

(iii) The following may be noted:—

ഞങ്ങൾ തങ്ങൾ ñaṅṅaḷ taṅṅaḷ 'we ourselves';

സിംഹങ്ങൾ തന്നുടെ simhaṅṅaḷ tannuḍe [sing. tannuḍe associated with a plural noun];

ദന്തങ്ങൾ തന്നുടെ dantaṅṅaḷ tannuḍe;

പുണ്യങ്ങൾ തന്നുടെ വൈഭവം puṇyaṅṅaḷ tannuḍe;

മന്ത്രികളെല്ലാരും തന്നുടെ തന്നുടെ mantrigaḷ-ellārum tannuḍe tannuḍe [Note, besides the use of the singular tannuḍe, the iteration of tannuḍe; this is quite common in KG and even in Eḷ];

തങ്ങളിൽ തങ്ങളിൽ taṅṅaḷil taṅṅaḷil.

10.. Verb- bases:—

ഓര് ōr	പുലമ്പ് pulamb-'to appear'	വീയ് vīy-
താവ് tāv-	കേഴ് kēḷ-	നണ്ണ് n'aṇṇ-
മെത്ത് mett-	പൂക് pūg-	തൺപെട് taṇpeḍ-
ഇയല് iyal-	മാഴ്ക് māḷg-	ഓങ്ങ് ōṅṅ- 'to appear'
പയററ് payaṯṯ-	ഉഴയ്ക്ക് uḷai-kk-	തുമൈക്ക് tumai-kk- 'to sneeze'
ചുവത്ത് cuvatt-		

എശ്' ēś-	പടുക്ക്' padu-kk- 'to become soft'	തലപ്പെട്' talapped-
ഓല്' ōl-	എഴ്' eḷ-	മെരിള്' meriḷ-
കോല്' kōl-	തഴയ്ക്ക്' taḷaikk-	പെണ്ണ്' peṇṇ-
ഓട്' ōd-	തമിഴ്' tamiḷ-	തഞ്ച്' tañj-
അഞ്ച്' añj-		

(ii) Adaptations from Skt:— മേളിക്ക mēḷikk-, ശംസിക്ക śamsikk-, ഗോപിക്ക്' gōpikk-, തേവാരിക്ക്' tēvārikk-, ന്യസിക്ക്' n'yasikk-, തർപ്പിക്ക്' taṛpikk-, സമ്മാനിക്ക്' sammānikk- 'to honour', etc.

(iii) പെടുക്ക്' pedu-kk, വളക്ക vaḷaṛ-kk (beside വളർത്ത്' valaṛtt-), താഴ്ക്ക്' tāḷ-kk- (beside tāḷtt-), ഉയക്ക uyaṛ-kk (beside ഉയർത്ത്' uyaṛtt-), തളക്ക്' taḷaṛ-kk, വിടക്ക്' vidur-kk, വീഴ്ക്ക്' vīḷ-kk (beside വീഴ്ത്ത്' vīḷtt-)

(iv) The older use of en- in എന്മർ enmar, എന്നുമ്പോൾ ennumbōḷ, എന്മോളം enmōḷam, എന്മാൻ enmān, എന്നാൻ (=പറഞ്ഞാൻ) en'n'ān.

(v) val- in വല്ലീല vallīla, വല്ലുന്നുടു vallun'n'ūdu, വല്ലു vallū, വല്ലുവോൻ valluvōn, the negatives വല്ലേൻ vallēn and വല്ലാർ vallār, വല്ലാതെ vallāde, വല്ലാഞ്ഞു vallāññ-.

(vi) ol- in ഒല്ലാ ollā, ഒല്ലാഞ്ഞു' ollāññu.

(vii) arud- in അരുതായുന്നു arudāyun'n'u, അരുതാഞ്ഞു arudāññu, അരുതാത arudāda, അരുതാതേ arudādē.

arudu, preceded by the infinitive participle, exclusively signifies 'difficulty' or 'impossibility' in KG.

11. Personal endings:—Forms with and without personal endings appear; wherever they appear, the personal terminations are of the following types.

Fairly frequent are the following:—First person present and past sing.; third person "rational" past sing. and plural; second pers. past sing.; first person sing. future.

The following are represented, though not very frequent:—
First person present plural നിന്നിടുന്നോം n'in'n'īdun'n'ōm.
Second person present sing. പോകുന്നായോ pōgun'n'āyō ചാടിക്കുന്നായോ cadikkun'n'āyō.

Second person future sing. ചൊല്ലുവായ്' colluvāy and third person future pl. n'alguvar, കോഴപ്പെടുപ്പർ kōḷappeduppar.

The following are peculiar:—പൊറുപ്പൻ നീ poṛuppan n'ī ചൊല്ലിനൻ നീ collinān n'ī, ആക്കിനാൻ നീ ākkinān n'ī.

12. Past stems:—ആണ്ണ് āṇṇ-, വീണ്ണ് vīṇṇ-(beside വീണ് vīṇ-), തമിണ്ണ് tamiṇṇ-, പുകണ്ണ് pugaṇṇ-, ഉമിണ്ണ് umiṇṇ-(beside ഉമിഞ്ഞ് umiññ-), താണ്ണ് tāṇṇ- (beside താണ് tāṇ-), വീണ്ട് vīḍ- of vī, ചൊന്ന് conn-.

13. Future with -um: ഞങ്ങൾ ചൊല്ലും ñaṅṅaḷ collum, നിങ്ങൾ കൂടും n'iṅṅaḷ kūḍum, നാലും നീ n'aḷum n'ī are some instances of the use of um for the first and the second persons.

14. Aoristic tense with ū.—All old types exist in KG. The following formations with analogical ū may be noted as almost unique: ഉള്ളില് uḷḷilū, കയ്യില് kayyilū; ഉണ്ടുള്ള് uṇḍ-uḷḷū is a peculiar form.

15. The old infinitive participle is represented in most of its old syntactic varieties:—(i) "Simultaneity":—നോക്കി നിന്നിടവേ n'ōkki n'in'n'īḍavē, കാണക്കാണ kāṇakkāṇa, വിള വിള viḷa viḷa, പൊന്നപ്പൊന്ന poññappoñña, തുള്ളത്തുള്ള tuḷḷattuḷḷa; (ii) "Effect":—വേറപ്പോക്കുവാൻ vēr-aṛa-p-pōkkuvān, ഉള്ളം കലുങ്ങക്കരഞ്ഞു uḷḷam kuluṅṅa-k-karaññu, കേൾക്കച്ചൊന്നാൻ kēḷkka-c-connān-; (iii) with tuḍaṅṅ-:— ഉക്കത്തുടങ്ങിനാൻ ūkkattuḍaṅṅ-, എഴത്തുടങ്ങി eḷattuḍaṅṅi (beside എഴുന്ന് തുടങ്ങി eḷun'n'u tuḍaṅṅi).

16. ആറ് āṟu, suffixed to relative participles, signifies 'manner'. ആറേ āṟē in the same context denotes 'time'.

17. Conditionals and concessives:— ചാർത്തിനാൽ cārttināl, പുലർന്നുടനാൽ pularn'n'ūḍānāl are peculiar.

ālum in ആറാലും arālum, ēlum in ആറേലും ārēlum, ēnum in എന്നേനും eññēnum etc.

18. Imperatives:—നീ കൊൾവൂ n'ī koḷvū, നീ ചൊൽവൂ n'ī col vū, നാം വച്ചുകൊൾവൂ n'ām..koḷvū, പൂജിപ്പൂ നാം pūjippū n'ām; ഞാൻ മുകർന്നുടാവൂ, ചേർത്തുടാവൂ mugarn'n'ūḍāvū, cērttūḍāvū, നാം ആണുങ്ങളായാവൂ āṇuṅṅaḷāyāvū, ഞാൻ ആരായ്‌വൂ ārāyvū, അവൻ വന്നാവുതു van'n'āvūdū, etc.

19. Third personal appellatives:—ദൂരത്തോൻ dūrattōn, പിന്നിലോൻ pinnilōn, കാനനം തന്നിലോൻ kānanam tannilōn, സർപ്പത്തൻ sarpattān, കാറ്റചാടയോൻ kaṭṭacaḍayōn, ചാർത്താരിൽ മാതിനെപ്പുണ്ണന്ന

മാറുടയോൻ mārudayōn, ദൂരത്തൂടു dūrattūdu, ചാരത്തൂടു cārattūdu, നല്ലൂടു n'allūdu, എണ്ണൂടു eṅṅūdu, ഉള്ളൂടു uḷḷūdu.

20. Negatives with tense-suffixes:— കാണായിന്നു kāṇāyin'n'u, അരുതായുന്നു arudāyun'n'u, പൊറുക്കരുതായുന്നു porukk-arudāyun'n'u.

The past type is quite common.

The future is represented only in participials like വരാത്തിന്നു°, etc.

Prohibitives like വരായ്ക varāyga, നില്ലായ്വിൻ n'illāyvin, പോകായ്വിൻ pogāyvin; participles like തൻ പെടായ്വാൻ taṇ pedāyvān, നെറിടായ്വാൻ n'ēridāyvān.

Aorist forms:—First pers. sing വല്ലേൻ vallēn, നല്കേൻ n'algēn, ചെയ്യേൻ cēyyen.

The second pers. sing and pl. are not met with.

Third person "rational" പോരാൾ pōrāḷ, നില്ലാർ n'illār, കൈവിടാർ kaividār.

Third person irrational പററാ paṟṟa, വരാ varā, ഏശാ ēśā.

21. Other negatives:— (i) ചെയ്യൊല്ലാതെ ceyyollādē, മറക്കൊല്ലാതെ marakkollādē, വാടൊല്ലാതെ vādollādē.

(ii) The type പൂകുന്നോനല്ല pūgun'n'ōnalla, ചിന്തുന്നോളല്ല cīndun'n'ōḷalla, കയർക്കുന്നേനല്ല kayarkkun'n'ēnalla, തോന്നുന്നൂതില്ല tōn'n'un'n'ūdilla.

(iii) ollā in ഞാനൊല്ലാ നൂളൊല്ലാ n'ūḷollā is used also for the first person.

(iv) വന്നുകൂടാ van'n'u kūdā, വചിച്ചുകൂടാ vaciccu kūdā and similar constructions have only the meaning of "impossibility". The more modern signification of "prohibition" does not exist for this type in KG.

(v) കൊല്ലാതേ കൊൾ kollādē koḷ, താരാതെ കൊൾവാൻ tārādē koḷ, കുമ്പാതെ കൊള്ളുവാൻ kūmbādē koḷ.

22. Miscellaneous:—(i) കളിച്ചുണ്ടു° kaḷiccuṇḍu, വന്നുണ്ടു° van'n'uṇḍu (=modern കളിച്ചിട്ടുണ്ടു kaḷiccittuṇḍu, van'n'ittuṇḍu).

(ii) വന്നാനും van'n'ānum with the meaning of 'would have come'.

(iii) A finite with-ūdum stands requently in KG for the conditional idea expressed today by-ēnē (as in പോയേനേ pōyēnē):—

ആനനം കണ്ടാകിൽ....പൂണ്ടൂടും താൻ pūṇḍūdum; തോരംവെള്ളക്കടകിൽ ഏററം നിറന്നൂടും n'iṟan'n'ūdum; ഇന്നിടു നൽകുകിൽ നന്നായിടും in'n'idu n'algugil n'an'n'āyidum; കണ്ടുള്ളോരാരാനമുണ്ടായിരുന്നാകിൽ കണ്ണുനീരിന്നമേറാഞ്ഞിടും maṟāññidum; ഞാൻ യാചിച്ചുനിന്നാകിൽ തന്നൂടും താൻ tan'n'ūdum tān.

5. OLDER FEATURES IN THE LANGUAGE OF EḶUTTAŚŚAN

Though Eḷuttaśśan may be considered as having "ushered in" the New Mal. period, there was no complete break with the past, and several older linguistic features continued to exist in the language employed by this great writer.

I sum up below these older features, particularly those in morphology. Some of these may have been merely due to what one may term "linguistic tradition", while the others represented the living language of the times. It may not be possible to differentiate these two in all instances, especially in view of the fact that the tempo of the evolution of Mal. varied with regions and communities; but many instances may, on the basis of circumstantial evidence, be classified as "purely traditionary" or "actively colloquial" during the period.

I have cited instances here from Rāmāyaṇam, Mahābhāratam, Cintāratnam, the first nine skandhas of Bhāgavatam, Harin'āmakīṟttanam and Kaivalyan'avan'ītam.

Inflexions.

1. Nominal bases.—Many old bases, not current in modern Mal., occur in Eḷ's works: അന്തണർ andaṇar, വാനുലകം vānulagam, ഇണ്ടൽ iṇḍal, ഇടർ iḍar, വിണ്ണോർ viṇṇōr, ആയർ āyar, വിള viḷa, പൈ pai [= വിശപ്പ് viśappu], എപ്പേരും eppērum, അത്തൽ attal, ഉമ്പർക്ക umbarkku, മറയോർ maṟayōr, മാൽ māl, തീയതു tīyadu, ചാക്ക് cākku 'death', കള്ളക്കാട kaḷḷakkāḍu 'adharma', [cf. കാടായ് ചൊല്ലുക kāḍ-āy 'wrongly', 'imperfectly' in KG and in Rām. camp.], പാലന്നം pālannam 'swan'; old compounds like കാലനൂർ kālanūr, പററലർ കാലന്മാർ paṟṟalar kālanmār, നൂററുപേർ nūṟṟupēr, കൊണ്ടൽനേർവർണ്ണൻ koṇḍal n'ēr vaṟṇṇan, മൈക്കണ്ണി mai-k-kaṇṇi,

കണ്ണൽ നേർമിഴിയാൾ kannal n'ēr miḷiyāḷ, മാൻനേർമിഴിത്തയ്യലാൾ mān n'ēr miḷi-t-tayyalāḷ, മാർഗ്ഗങ്ങളുടെ മറപൊരുൾ maargaḷuḍe maṟa-poruḷ, etc.

2. The association with bases of datival -n(u) and -kk(u) had become more or less clearly differentiated by the time of Eḷ; but one finds പോർക്കു pōṟkku beside pōrinu, കാല്ക്കു kālkku, വിരല്ക്കു viralkku, തണ്ണീർക്കു taṇṇīṟkku, കാലനൂർക്കു kālan-ūrkku; but പാരിന്നു pārinnu.

3. The sixth case nd'e has of course become fully evolved but-uḍe is sometimes employed in the stead of nd'e for "prosodic" purposes. The older usage of the type ഭരതൻ തൻ ചൊല്ലാലെ bharatan tan col'āle to express the genitive idea is also met with in Eḷ. as an "archaism".

4. -uḷḷōvē as a sambodhana ending exists in Eḷ's Bh.

edō occurs in Eḷ in connection with both masculines and feminines, with the connotation of 'familiarity without contempt': എന്റെടോ സുന്ദരിയായ നീ endēḍō sundariyāya n'ī.

5. The plural നിർമ്മര്യാദങ്ങൾ n'iṟmmaryādaṅṅaḷ beside നിർമ്മര്യാദകൾ n'iṟmmaryādagaḷ; മകളർ magaḷar; നാൽവർ, മൂവർ, എണ്മർ; ഭ്രാതാക്കൾ bhrātākkaḷ, രാജാക്കൾ rājākkaḷ; കുറളക്കാരർ kuraḷakkārar, ചതിക്കാരർ cadikkārar.

6. The locative postposition pōkkal and the ablative pōkkal-n'in'n'u are met with in Eḷ.

Other old postpositions are cārattu, aṇayattu, agalattu, arigattu.

7. Instances like the following are not unusual in Eḷ: അവിടേക്കായ്ക്കൊണ്ടിനിപ്പോകുന്നു aviḍēkkāykkoṇḍu; സുഗ്രീവനായ്ക്കൊണ്ടു രാജ്യം നല്കിനാൻ sugrīvanāykkoṇḍu; അവനോടായ്ക്കൊണ്ടു ചോദിച്ചാൻ avanōḍāykkoṇḍu cōdiccān; പുത്രരോടായ്ക്കൊണ്ടേവം ഉപദേശിച്ചു putrarōḍāykkoṇḍ-upadēśiccu

8. Directives with āykkoṇḍu, n'ōkki, āmmāṟu, besides others.

9. The following peculiarities of "casal" concord:

(i) പിന്നിട് pinnid-, മുന്നിട് munnid-, വേറിട് vēṟid- often govern the accusative.

(ii) 'Separation' is optionally associated with the third case ending ഓടു ōḍu.

(iii) 'Fear' is associated with the fifth case rarely in instances like രാഘവൻ പോക്കൽ നിന്നുള്ള ഭയം Rāghavan pōkkal n'in'n'uḷḷa bhayam.

10. The augment-at't-is very commonly employed in the inflexions of the neuter plurals ava, iva pala, ellā. While അവററെ avat'te, അവററിൻ avat'tin, പലററിലും palat'tilum, ഇവററാൽ, etc. are common, forms like അവയിററിലും avayit'tilum, പലവററിൽ palavat'til, etc. do not exist in Eḷ.

എല്ലായിലും ellāyilum without the augment does occur, though rarely.

ഇവകൊണ്ടു ivakoṇḍu, അവകൊണ്ടു avakoṇḍu, പലവുംകൊണ്ടുവന്നു palavum koṇḍu van'n'u are instances where the augment-at't-is is absent.

11. പലവും palavum [the old plural] and പലദും paladum are both used by Eḷ in pronominal apposition: പലവുംശാസ്ത്രങ്ങൾ palavum, ഫലമൂലാദികൾ പലവും, beside ഇഴജന്തുജാലംപലതും paladu, ദുർന്നിമിത്തങ്ങൾപലതു്, etc.

12. എങ്ങൾ eṅṅaḷ-as an inflexional base; forms like tam-m-e. tam-m-māl and tam-m-uḍe.

13. The employment of forms of tān and tām, as in the following:—തനിയേപരിദേവനംചെയ്തു taniyē alone'; ഗോക്കൾതങ്ങളെ gōkkaḷ taṅṅaḷē 'the cows of their own accord'; തന്നുടെതന്നുടെ tannuḍe tannuḍe; തങ്ങളാൽ തങ്ങളാൽ ആയവല്ലൊരവും taṅṅaḷāl taṅṅaḷāl.

Verbs.

1. Some of the older verb-bases occurring in Eḷ but now gone out of use, are the following:—ōr-, tāḷug-, māḷg-, iḷaikk-, uḷṟ-, kiḷaikk-, vāykk-, taykk-[used in also the present and in the future, as taykkun'n'u, taykkum-bōḷ], mīḷ-, mut't-, n'aṇṇ-, īḷkk-, ūkk- [n'īr ūkk-], kiḷar-'to rise', polikk-'to extinguish', vāṅṅ [=modern pin-vāṅṅ- to retreat'], karayēṟ-, karēṟ- [no kayaṟ-or kēṟ-in Eḷ], padukk-, anb-, ēg-. iṟakk-, n'īkkoḷ-.

2. Denominative verbs like ഗർബ്ബിച്ചു garbiccu, ഏകിച്ചു ēgiccu, ഉഷ്ണിച്ചു uṣṇiccu, ഗന്ധിച്ചു gandhiccu, ഉഷെക്കും വിധൌ uṣekkum vidhau, മോഹിച്ചു mōhiccu 'having become desperate' [a

meaning not current for this word today], വ്യഗ്രിച്ചു vyagriccu, kṛuddhiccu, bhalsiccu, n'amiccu.

3. The bases peḍu-kk- [1], vaḷaṛ-kk-, amaṛ-kk-, [modern peḍuttvaḷaṛtt- and amaṛtt-] having their past with-i-, occur in Eḷ. peḍukk is almost exclusive in Eḷ, while vaḷaṛtt- and amaṛttalternate with vaḷaṛ-kk-and amaṛ-kk-

ചുവത്തുക cuvatt- 'to make red' is common.

4. ഉളർ uḷar, ഉളരായാർ uḷar-āyār, ഉളനായേൻ uḷanāyēn are traditionary forms occurring in Eḷ.

5. അരുതു arudu in compounds with the infinitive participle as the first constituent, expresses in Eḷ both the older ideas of 'difficulty, impossibility' as in ചൊല്ലവശക്തി ചൊല്ലരുതേതുമേ, and the evolved idea of 'prohibition' [the modern meaning].

As verbal forms, അരുതാഞ്ഞു arudān'n'u, അരുതാത arudāda have the older meaning.

എന്നാർ ചിലർ en'n'ār and എന്മാൻ enmān are instances of forms of en- with the primary meaning 'to say'.

6. Val- occurs not only in വല്ലേൻ vallen, വല്ലാഞ്ഞു vallānn- വല്ലാതെ vallāde, വല്ലാത vallāda [older meaning], വല്ല valla [modern meaning !], but also as വല്ലുകയില്ല vallugayilla.

ol- also appears as ollā, ollāda, ollāde; pollādā kaṛmmam shows a form of the "defective" verb pol-.

7. The reinforcer-kk-is absent in forms like തോലാതവണ്ണം tōlādavaṇṇam, ഇരിയ് iriyā, ബഹുമാനിയാതെ bahumāniyādē, കേളാതെ kēḷādē.

8. The use of personal endings for tense-forms in Eḷ's works is purely a tradition inherited from the past. These personal endings must have died out from the colloquial some centuries before the time of Eḷ.

It is to be noted that Eḷ avoids using personal endings for the second person plural,[1] the first person plural, third person

(1) El uses ബദ്ധപ്പെടുക-generally to mean 'bind, as a captive' [El Ram, p. 217], but Bhag. has ബദ്ധപ്പെട്ടു with the meaning having been in a hurry'.

(1) Rarely, second personal sing. forms are met with—കണ്ടേയോ [Bh], മറിഞ്ഞാലയോ [Bh]

'irrational'' plural. I have already pointed out that, while the Niraṇam Paṇikkars employ personal endings for all these types, the personal endings for these types become more and more infrequent in the texts, till in Eḷ they appear uniformly without personal terminations.

Nor does Eḷ use the negative aorist tenses with personal endings like the Paṇikkars. Of course, forms like കൂടാ kūḍā, വരാ varā, ചെയ്യാ ceyyā, [employed for all persons!] do occur; but those with personal endings like അറിയോം aṛiyōm, വാരായ് vārāy, പോകേൻ pōgēn are conspicuous by their absence, except for the "traditional'' ചൊല്ലവല്ലേൻ colla vallēn.

9: Among the past stems, pugaḷn'n'- beside pugaṇṇ-, magiḷn'n'- beside magiṇṇ- occur in Eḷ.

Other old past stems are kudaṛn'n'- [for modern kudaṛi], kiḷaṛn'n'- [for kiḷaṛi-].

Past forms like മുടക്കിയാൻ muḍakkiyān, ചൊല്ലിയേൻ colliyēn are met with beside മുടക്കിനാൻ muḍakkinān, etc.

10. The ū- aorist occurs in Eḷ with all its older syntactic significations.

നല്ലു n'allū, എന്നു eññū, അവങ്കളു avaṅgalū, എവിടത്തു eviḍattū also illustrate the dominance of the use of this particle during the period.

11. The older use of the infinitive participle with -a, illustrated by the following instances, was, in Eḷ's period, perhaps tradition-derived:—കേൾക്കപ്പറഞ്ഞില kēḷkka-p-paṛaññila, നിവിര നിലവിളിച്ചു n'ivira n'ilaviḷiccu, ചൊല്ലവല്ലേൻ colla vaḷḷēn, വില്ലു കുഴിയെക്കുലച്ചു villu kuḻiye-k-kulaccu, വിരയെപ്പോയ് viraye-p-pōy [beside വിരവോടു പോയ് viravōḍū pōy, or വിരഞ്ഞു പോയ് viraññu pōy], വിരയെക്കൊടുക്ക നീ viraye-k-koḍukka n'ī, അടയസ്സംഹരിച്ചു aḍaya-s-samhariccu, കേളത്തുടങ്ങിനാർ kēḷa-t-tuḍaññinār [beside common കേണ്ടുടങ്ങി kēṇu tuḍaññi], എല്ലാവരും കാണ്കെ ഇളച്ചടും ellāvarum kāṇge iḷaccadum [Note peculiar use of കാണ്കെ kāṇge instead of കാണെ kāṇe; such instances exist in the campus.]

12. കാണായ് kāṇāy, കാണാവു kāṇāvū, കാണാവതല്ല kāṇāvadalla illustrate the use of the forms of the older compounds of the inf. participle with āg-.

13. El's use of ഒക്കൈക്കും okkaikkum in Cint. shows how this old infinitive participle had already become "decolorised".

14. Relative participles with-ina, like tiññina, vāññīḍina, etc., are "traditionary" forms, the characteristic Mal. forms being with -iya.

15. āṛu, preceded by relative participles, occurs with the meanings of 'manner' and of 'time' in El.

16. The singular imperative of the type of കൊല്ലാദേ collāde is occasionally met with in El.

17. Optatives like ജയിപ്പൂദാക രാമൻ jayippūdāgā rāman, അറിയുമായ്വരിക ariyumāyvariga.

18. The particle-vān expressive of 'doubt' as in ആരുവാൻ āruvān, occurs in Cintāratnam.

19. The unique Mal. negatives with tense-affixes are all represented in El's works, though the more common type of negative forms also abounds.

ചെയ്യായുന്നു ceyyāyun'n'u and kūdāyun'ṇ'u are pr. tense forms.

The past tense type is more numerously represented.

Though I have not been able to locate any future negative finites of the types of ചെയ്യായും ceyyāyum and ചെയ്യായ്വൂ ceyyāyvū in El's works, forms like കൂട്ടക്കായ്വദിന്നു kūṭṭakkāyvadinnu based on future stems, exist.

Infinitive participles like തട്ടായ്വാൻ taṭṭāyvān, ഓടായ്വാൻ ōḍāyvan; plural imperatives like മിണ്ടായ്വിൻ miṇḍāyvin, ഉലറായ്വിൻ ularāyvin, collāyvin; polite imperatives like ഓരായ്ക ōrayga; verbal nouns of the type of ചെയ്യായ്ക ceyyāyga; the forms ഇല്ലയാത illayāda, അല്ലയായ്കിൽ allayāygil, ഇല്ലയാഞ്ഞു are all met with in El s works.

20. Negative forms like അറിയാവതല്ലേതും arīyāvadallēdum, നീക്കാവതല്ല n'īkkāvadalla, ആക്രമിക്കാമല്ല ākramikkāmalla.

21. The occurrence of a form like കൊല്ലാദേകൊല്ലാഞ്ഞു kollāde koḷḷāññu [El. Bh, p. 379] shows how modern colloquial കൊല്ലാണ്ടു kollāṇḍu is to be derived from kollāde koṇḍu

[the past participle of kollāde koḷ—of which the negative participle appears as kollāde koḷḷāññ-]. [Cf. instances from KG cited above].

22. കേട്ടോളം kēṭṭōḷam, കണ്ടോളം kaṇḍōḷam, ഓർത്തോളം ōṛttōḷam; and കേട്ടകൊണ്ടു kēṭṭa koṇḍu.

23. Appellatives like എഞ്ഞോൻ eññōn.

24. മടിപോരും madi pōrum,

എന്നി enni and എന്നിയേ en'n'iyē corresponding to ഇന്നി in'n'i, ഇൻറി ind'i and ഇൻറിയേ ind'iyē of the Paṇikkars.

A comparison of the morphological features of Eḷ's language with those of KG shows that, while there are many feature in common, Eḷ's language evidences a few conspicuous differences or developments also:—

(i) the absence of uḷḷōnē and of uḷḷōyē; the rarity of uḷḷōvē; the form pōkkal; the rarer use of eññal-; the use of paladu besides palavu (in connection with plurals); the directives with-ōṭṭ, ēkk and iṅgalēkk·

(ii) arudu denoting 'prohibition'; fewer types of tense-forms showing personal terminations; the replacement of tāṇṇ-, vīṇṇ- by tāṇ-, vīṇ-; absence of conn- and of vīd-; the absence of forms like tan'n'ūdum, n'iṟan'n'ūdum, etc; the rarity of the terminative expletive ē (so frequent in KG); etc.

6. OLD MALAYĀḶAM AND NEW MALAYĀḶAM.

As already noted by me in the Introduction, the period of New Mal. may be said to begin from about the sixteenth century. The language of Eḻuttaššan, however, continues to show some peculiarities of Old Mal., by the side of several characteristic features of New Mal·; and conversely, certain New Mal· features already appear in KG and in the 15th century campus. In spite of this overlapping, it is not difficult to demarcate those morphological developments which characteristically appertain to the New Mal. stage.

Inflexions.

1· The absence in New Mal. of postpositions like pōkkal; of iḍa, uḷ; of koṇḍu and toṭṭu with a second case force; of uḷḷōyē and uḷḷōvē; of edō in connection with women (except regionally).

2. The practice, current in the maṇipravāḷa period, of using samskṛtīkṛta bhāṣā [1] i.e., native words with Ṣanskrit endings, practically disappeared in the period of the campus; but echoes of the older practice still remained in a few instances cited above in Candr. This practice disappeared in the New Mal. period.

3. The practice of introducing syntactic concord between viśeṣaṇa and viśeṣya, as in the campus, was also a temporary aberration under Sanskrit influence. This generally disappeared in the New Mal. period, though Uṇṇāyi with his extraordinary attachment to Sanskrit has sometimes used such constructions in Nal. Āṭṭ.

4. Similarly, imitations of Sanskrit "case"-concord, as in ഗ്രാമത്തെ ആവസിക്കുന്നോൻ grāmatte āvasikkund'ōn രാജ്യത്തെ അധിവസിച്ചു rājyatte adhivasiccu [already condemned by the commentary on Līl. II, II, comm.], ആപത്തിങ്കൽ നിന്നു ഭയപ്പെട്ടു āpattiṅgal n'in'n'u bhaya-ppeṭṭu have also fallen into disuse.

5. The directives of the types of vīṭṭilēkku and kiḻōṭṭu became permanently fixed in New Mal. The directives with n'ōkki, āmmāṛu, āykkoṇḍu are out of vogue today.

6. The use of phrasal units of the type of കാട്ടിലെ ആന kāṭṭile āna was extended to instances like അങ്ങനത്തേ aṅṅanatt ē ഉച്ചക്കേത്തേ uccakkētte, വന്നാളത്തെക്കാര്യം van'n'ālattē-k-kāryam, etc.

7. eṅṅaḷ- the "oblique" form disappeared, except in certain "communal" colloquials.

8. tām is represented in New Mal. commonly only in tamil, while taniyē and tānē are on the road to ruin; tān tānd'e, tand'e tand'e, taṅṅaḷkku taṅṅaḷkku and similar collocations with taṅṅaḷ, and taṅṅaḷ-ē 'alone' have all disappeared.

9. ava and iva in New Mal. are used as such without the cāriyai or augment-at't'-in "oblique" inflexions.

1. A few instances of these may be cited here:—Native nouns with Sanskrit endings, like തൊങ്ങലാം, ഉന്തോലകം, [Lil., cit., 2, 7], മാടമ്പിമാം US]; native verbs with Sanskrit verb-endings like പിന്നിടേഥാം [US], കേഴന്തി [L, cit., 2,, 17], ചോര്‍ക്കാം ചുരക്കു [ib.] പൊക്കിനെ, മമണ്ടിനൊത്തെ ളിനെ [ib.]

Together with this, അവററ avat't'a, അവററകൾ avat'ťagaḷ, അവററിങ്ങൾ avat't'iṅṅaḷ are used in regional colloquials as nominatives used with reference to inanimate objects.

10. paladu and ciladu have become quite common in connection with plurals.

Verbs.

1. Many old verb-bases gradually disappeared. Bases like vīḷ-kk-, peḍu-kk-, vaḷaṛ-kk-, tāḷ-kk- were gradually ousted in New Mal. by vīḻtt-, peḍutt-, etc.

2. por- has given place to porud- [past stem porud-i-]; karēṛ-has been replaced by kayaṛ-; arudu is generally used with the signification of "prohibition"; en- 'to say' is no longer used with the original meaning 'to say or speak'; val is retained only in valla 'any', vallātta [generalised meaning], vallādē and vallāṇḍu; uḷ-is represented only by uṇḍu, uḷḷū, uḷḷā, uḷḷadu, etc.

3. Personal endings of tense- froms are pure "archaisms" in New Mal.

4. While -in'n'- and -un'n'- existed in Old Mal. as the present tense affix, -un'n'- became exclusive in New Mal.

5. eḻun'in'n'- is replaced by eḻun'ēťť-, and tāṇṇ, vīṇṇ-, by tāṇ-, vīṇ-; vīśi- and cāri- are exclusive past stems of vīś- and cār-.

6. The -um future finites were not quite numerous in Old Mal. texts for the 1st and the 2nd persons [for which, texts show more numerously instances with personal endings like ñān varuvan, n'ī varuvāy, etc.]. In New Mal. literature, ñān varum, n'ī varum, avar varum become quite common.

7. The ū- "aorist" becomes gradually restricted to a few syntactic types.

8. The infinitive participle with- a becomes limited to the contexts already mentioned in Chap. IV, § 7 above.

9. The participle followed by āṛu, signifying "manner" exists only in instances like ceyyumāṛu [ceyyāṛu], kāṇumāṛu; the type with āṛē, denoting 'time' persists today in regional colloquials.

10. Third personal optatives of the type of avan varuga no longer exist.

11. The conditional with -gil continued to exist in literature; but in the colloquial it was gradually displaced by the conditional of the ceyd-āl type; today, the latter alone occurs in the colloquial.

12. The tense- type van'n'ēnē appears in New Mal.

13. Among the negative verb- forms (conjugated with tense affixes or verbal endings), only the past stem and the verbal noun are retained in the colloquials.

14. The neg. rel. participle of the varāda type appears as varātta in New Mal.

15. The negative types ceyyun'n ōnalla, pulambun'n'ūdalla; and pugaḷttāmalla, collāvalla have all disappeared.

16. Varallē type replaces the prohibitive varōllā.

17. Ceyyarudu is exclusively a prohibitive; ceydu kūḍā and ceyya vayyā have developed "prohibitive" meanings beside the older significations.

Ceyyān mēlā crops up in New Mal. literature.

CHAPTER VII.—AFFILIATIONS.

1. MAL. AND TAM.

The question of fixing the degree of the linguistic relationship of Malayāḷam to the other Dravidian speeches of South India has to be approached with reference to two aspects:— (a) how far Malayāḷam is much nearer related to Tamil than to any other south Dravidian speech; and (b) if Malayāḷam is found to be much more intimately allied to Tamil than to any other south Dravidian speech, to which particular stage of Tamil it shows the maximum resemblance.

The criteria evolved by modern linguistics for estimating the degrees of kinship among languages cannot be better stated than in the words of the *doyen* among modern French linguisticians, Prof. Antoine Meillet (Le probleme de la parente des langues, pp. 88, 84):—"Linguistic kinship is evident wherever the phonetic and the grammatical systems present exact resemblances, wherever regular correspondences permit of the recognition of the unity of the origin of these features, and wherever the grammatical forms could be traced to a common original starting point." "Vocabulary is the domain of loans. There is no word in a given language of which we cannot say *a priori* that it has not been borrowed from a foreign speech. There is no language, the vocabulary of which does not include borrowings. It is, therefore, more than anything else by the persistence of the phonetic and the grammatical systems that the "kinship of languages" expresses itself."

Resemblances in phonetics (including phonology) and in grammar, therefore, form the essential criteria of linguistic kinship. Vocabularial parallelisms of course are not entirely negligible, but they are significant only when the question of borrowings has been fully tackled.

The application of these fundamental tests reveals beyond doubt that Malayāḷam is far more intimately allied to Tam. than to any other Dr. speech.

I shall mention below some of the essential features of the Tamil-Malayāḷam group, that mark it off from other Dr. speeches:—

Phonetics and Phonology:— (i) the alveolar plosives and the sandhi contexts in which they occur; (ii) the persistence of

ḷ and ṛ; (iii) the difference between dental n' and alveolar n; (iv) the regular sonatisation of intervocal surds; (v) the uniform sonatisation of surds and affricates in the consonant groups with nasals; (vi) the development of the affricate c from k; (vii) the palatalisation of-k-in internal positions; (viii) external sandhi of different types, particularly in compounds; (ix) many internal sandhi changes.

Morphology:—(i) Many suffixes associated with gender; (ii) plural formations with mār; (iii) "casal" terminations, augments and many postpositions; (iv) verb-bases with the kārita affix; (v) transitival bases; (vi) Present tense ending; (vii) formation of past stems; (viii) Inf. participles with vān, etc; (ix) many imperatives; (x) negative tenses and forms.

While I have pointed out above the parallelisms, I may also observe here that there is not one single native feature of Malayāḷam phonetics or Malayāḷam morphology which can be shown to be nearer related to any Dravidian speech than to Tamil.

2. FEATURES OF MAL. MORPHOLOGY WHICH CAN BE HISTORICALLY DERIVED FROM A STAGE CORRESPONDING TO MIDDLE TAM.

1. Among the nominal inflexions, the instrumental āl, the sing. genitive -nd'e, the loc. -il, and -kal; the use of the plural-kaḷ for 'rationals' as well as for 'irrationals' and of the double plurals with -mār-gaḷ; postpositions like koṇḍu, kuṛiccu, vare, pakkal, etc., the comparisonal -il and kāṭṭil.

2. The pronouns n'iṅṅaḷ [<n'īm-kaḷ], naṅṅaḷ [cf. n'āmgaḷ], eṅṅaḷ- [<eṅgaḷ], avargaḷ; and the use of ava in the "oblique" forms without the augment.

3. Verb-bases of the type of peḍu-kk- beside peḍutt-; bases like n'iṛutt-, irutt- [absent in Old Tam.]; the causative endings [from Middle Tam. vi type]; the Old Mal. personal endings ān, ār, ēn, ōm, āy; the present tense -in'n'-, -un'n'- [from Middle Tamil -g-ind']; the conditionals with -il; the concessives with -ānum, -ēnum,- ēlum; the use of the opt. ending -ga for the first and the second persons; the employment of the infinitive participles with -vān, -ppān; and many negative verb-forms.

Table showing the direct affinities of Mal. to Middle Tamil.

		Old Tam.	Middle Tam.	Mal.
	1	2	3	4
1.	3rd case affix	ān	āl	āl
	4th case	iṛ-ku [in-ku]	Early Middle Tam. in-u-kk	in-u-or -innu
	5th case	in	-il-n'inṛ-	il-n'in'n'u
	6th case	[-adu, etc.]	uḍai	uḍe, -(n)d'e
	7th case	[kaṇ, kāl, etc.]	il	il
	Postpositions	[loose]	[koṇḍu, pakkal, etc., freely used]	[Postpositions freely used]
	First person pl. pronoun	n'ām	n'ām-kaḷ	ñāṅṅaḷ, ñaṅṅaḷ and nammaḷ
	Second person pl. pronoun	n'īm	n'īm-gaḷ	n'iṅṅaḷ
	Third person pl. pronoun epicene.	avar	avargaḷ	avargaḷ
	Do do 'irrational'.	avai	avaigaḷ	avagaḷ
	Verb-bases like paḍuttu-, irutt-, n'iṛutt-.	[very rare]	[frequent]	[common,

	Old Tam.	Middle Tam.	Mal.
	2	3	4
Causatives with vi, bi, ppi.	[absent]	[common]	[common]
Personal terminations for tense-finites.	usually (an)en, (-an)-ai, (an)an, (an)-em, (an)ir, an ṟu	ēn, āy, ān, ōm, ār, ar.	Only Middle Tam. endings wherever used in Old Mal.
Present tense with-g-ind'.	[absent]	[common]	in'n', -un'n'
Future-aorist with-um.	[only for some forms of 3rd person]	[As in Old Tam.]	[Extended to all persons]
Optatives.	[For third person, generally speaking]	[For all persons]	[For all persons]
Infinitive participle with -vān, -bān, -ppān.	[absent]	[common]	vān, mān, ppān
Negative tense-forms with tense-affixes.	[absent]	[absent as such]	vārā-y-ind'-, etc., formed on the popular neg. base vārā
Negative verb-forms on the stem-type ceyyād-.	[present]	[present]	[present]
Negatives like ceyd-il-en, etc.	[rare]	[common]	ceydilla, etc.

3. CHIEF UNIQUE FEATURES OF MALAYALAM MORPHOLOGY.

The following are unique in Mal. in so much as they have neither direct counterparts nor direct "ancestral" forms in Middle or (except in (i) below) in Old Tamil.

(i) n'in- the Mal. inflexional base of the second person sing. is certainly an archaism in the west coast speech.

(ii) The use of n'iṅṅaḷ as an "oblique" form is unique in the west coast.

(iii) The aoristic future tense-forms with ū.

(iv) The type ചെയ്യാം ceyyām, as distinguished from Middle Tamil type ceyyalām.

(v) The plural [second person] imperative type ചെയ്യിൻ ceyvin, കൊടുപ്പിൻ koḍuppin, as distinct from the Tamil -min.

The ceyyām-type is apparently a future form with -um of the compunded base-type ceyy-āg, common in Old Mal.

As for the "aoristic" tense with ū, I have shown above [Chap. IV § 6] that it was probably formed in Mal. from modifications of forms which it shared with Tamil.

n'in-, the ceyyām type and the imperatives of the type of ceyvin, koḍuppin may have been archaic in Mal.; but it may be noted that no non-Tamil speech affords more direct representatives or nearer relatives than Tamil.

4. AFFILIATIONS.

As already pointed out § 2 above, it is with Early Middle Tamil that Malayāḷam is most intimately related.

I have been led to stress the question of affiliations so much here because of the view prevailing among some scholars in Malabar, that in point of linguistic kinship, Malayāḷam stands in relation to Tamil on as much a footing of equality as Kannaḍa or even Telugu.

Those who maintain that "Mal. is as much independent of Tamil as Kannaḍa or Telugu" seek support for their view in the following postulates of theirs. It is necessary to examine them here in some little detail in view of the vogue obtaining for them among some Malayāḷam scholars ; but I may say at once that some of these postulates (see below for discussion) are wholly untenable, while others are not capable of being satisfactorily

proved or supported, and further that even if it happens that some of these postulates could in the future be supported by data which are not now available, one has to remember that these features (appearing as archaisms) are after all so few that they cannot touch anything more than the outermost fringe of the problem of affinities; for, as I have already pointed out above, correspondences and derivative relationships between Mal. and a stage of speech answering to Early Middle Tamil are so numerous and so fundamental that there would be no scientific warrant for any view other than that Mal. is most intimately allied to a stage of speech [1] corresponding to Early Middle Tamil, with a few archaisms peculiar to the west coast.

I now proceed to discuss the postulates referred to above.

1. The suggestion is made that the final -a of Mal. nouns (and of a few other words), far from having been derived from the corresponding-ai of Tamil, represents the direct development of an original palatal-a in view of (i) the existence of -a in Telugu, corresponding to Mal. -a and Tam.-ai, as in Tel. tala 'head', oṛa 'sheath', koṛa 'defect' etc.; (ii) sūtra 284 of Tolkāppiyam Eḻuttu, which states that the-ai of panai, āvirai is 'dropped' in samāsa sandhi, as in panaṅgāy, āviraṅgāy,—a statement that is alleged to imply the fact that the original forms of these words may have been pana, etc., which in Tamil later developed into panai, etc.; and (iii) the adaptation by Tam. of some Sanskrit words (having final-a) with final-ai, as in Tam. śītai, etc.

Further support for this postulate is sought from the fact that Mal. illa, ava, iva corresponding to Tam. illai, avai, ivai [all

---

1. The real position may have been this. In the earliest centuries of the Christian era the west coast speech and the language that was used in post-Saṅgam texts (i. e. Early Middle Tam.) were fundamentally alike, with of course a few regional differences. This speech (which was later employed in literature by the Ṣaivite and Vaiṣṇavite bhaktas) may have already been developed in the colloquial of the masses some time about the beginning of the Christian era. Old Tamil which continued to be employed in the late Saṅgam texts may have by this time become a *kunstsprache.* In the east coast, the living speech of the masses was used in the works of the Ṣaivite and the Vaiṣṇavite saints after about the 5th century A. D. In the west coast, about this period the colloquial was perhaps gradually evolving characteristic Mal. features.

of which are already met with in the earliest Tam. texts contain -a, the original plural ending, which in Tam. may have developed into -ai, in these words. Again, Tolkāppiyam Eḻuttu, sūtra 373, which states that il takes-ai in samāsa sandhi [as in illai-k-koṭṭan] and the existence of illa in Kannaḍa are also pressed in support of the view.

It was Caldwell [Comp. Gr., p. 133] who first suggested that final-a of Mal. in these contexts may have been older than the corresponding Tam. -ai; but the only basis on which Caldwell rested his view was that Mal. and Tel. had a final a corresponding to Tam. ai. The above arguments have been advanced by later scholars. In my opinion, no one of these arguments can amount to a satisfactory proof for the position that Mal. -a was not evolved from Middle Tam. -ai as suggested by the inscriptional and literary instances and by general principles of phonetic change.

(i) There is nothing to disprove the suggestion that Tel. -a in tala, oṛa, etc., may not itself have been derived from an older -ai.

(ii) The Tol. Eḻuttu sūtra about the Tam. compound panaṅgāy offers little evidentiary value for the suggestion that pana was older than panai; for, in the first place, the sūtra states that -ai is elided [ai-y-en-iṛudi .. .. .. keḍumē] and, secondly, panaṅgāy may have been a reduced form of older panai-y-in-gāy [cf. the alternative ā-n- and ā-v-in, the inflexional stems of 'cow', according to TE, 121.]

(iii) Tam. adaptations like śīdai from Sanskrit sītā need not necessarily have involved a Tamil rule applicable to native forms like talai, panai. The shapes which adaptations from foreign languages assume in a language may very well be regulated by the analogy of already existing forms and can by no means always be regarded as pointing to an inflexible principle of phonetic change rooted in the speech. The forms with -ai, already existing in Tam., may have influenced the structure of these adaptations from Sanskrit.

(iv) illa, as used in Mal., corresponds to illai of Tamil, employed as a kuṛippu vinai particle for all genders, numbers and persons. Tam. has ila which is the regular third person

"neuter" plural of the kuṟippuvinai base il. Even granting that illai of Tam. is connected in some way with ila, there is very little proof for us to say that Mal. illa may not have been derived from illai, the negative particle, used for all genders, numbers and persons. Tam. illai may itself have been an independent formation from il, and it may not have been *directly* connected with the plural third person ila.

(v) As for ava, iva, it may be granted that the plural particle -a is of course appropriate in the terminal position here. But the plural particle is in Tamil always dorsal in tonality, as is evidenced by the back glide -v- appearing after pala and cila before words with initial vowels in syntactic sandhi positions, while Mal. ava, iva have a final -a which should originally have been palatal in tonality in view of the fact that the front glide-y- alone appears after it. This leads me to doubt the validity of the suggestion that -a of Mal. ava, iva is (as it at present stands) the plural particle -a. On the other hand, the fact that the palatal or front glide alone is associated with Mal. ava, iva, [cf. the inflexional forms avayuḍe, avayiṟṟil] perhaps points to their being immediately related to, and derived from, a stage corresponding to Middle Tam. avai, ivai.

None of the facts adduced in support of the view that Mal. -a is not directly connected with the corresponding Tam. -ai, can satisfactorily help this theory.

2. It is argued that the Mal. second case ending e is derived from an older palatal -a [of what one may postulate as 'parent Dravidian'], from which Tam. ai may have been separately derived, and that therefore the common view [approved by Kēraḷa Pāṇinīyam] that the Mal. second case ending -e is derived from Tam. -ai [just as colloquial Tam. has -e as a derivative of literary Tam. -ai] is not valid.

Support for this position is sought from the sūtra of Tolkāppiyam, Colladigāram, 108 [1], which states that in poetry the

---

1. TC, 108, states:—കു, ഐ, ആൻ എന വരൂഉം ഇറുതി അവ്വൊടു ചിവണം ചെയ്യുളുള്ള. Here, the -a is postulated not only in connection with ai but also with the dative ku and the instrumental ആൻ also; so that these appear in poetry as -a (Acc.), -ka (Dat.) and ആന (Instr.). The first two appear, according to another sutra, only in connection with rationals. There is nothing in all this to justify the view that -a was the original Acc. ending and ai secondary.

second case ending appears as -a instead of as -ai. It is argued that since poetry may preserve archaic forms, -a as the second case ending may be older than -ai.

The suggestion may have something in it; and one may be tempted to connect, in pursuance of this suggestion, the older -a of Tam.-Mal. with the -a that appears in Old Kannaḍa as a rare accusative ending. Some scholars have even gone further into the dark and suggested that this -a may have been a softened form of -an appearing as the accusative ending in Telugu, Kannaḍa, Gōṇḍi, Kūi, Kuṛukh and Karachi Brāhūī. But these suggestions and ingenious adventures into the unknown can never amount to proofs.

Be this as it may, there is as yet no fact or datum available, to prove conclusively what is suggested by the inscriptions and texts, and supported by phonetic analogy [cf. Mal. paṇḍe, vare, maṯṯe, n'āḷe with Tam. paṇḍai, varai, maṯṯai n'āḷai], viz. that Mal. acc. -e is derived from Tam. -ai.

3. The preservation of the distinction between dental n' and alveolar n, of which so much is made by some scholars to prove what they describe as the 'antiquity' of Mal., is not of much substance when one remembers that the distinction is clearly pointed out in the old Tamil grammars and preserved in the Tamil alphabet. Dental n' perhaps disappeared from colloquial Tamil pronunciation at a comparatively late stage after Mal. had branched off from Middle Tam.

4. Similarly, the fact that Mal. gives the long alveolar plosive ṯṯ the pure alveolar value both in the colloquial and in the literary speech, while modern Tam. evaluates it as ṯṯr, can be no proof at all for the view that 'Mal. is linguistically as much independent of Tam. as Kannaḍa or Telugu'. The incorporation of r in ṯṯr is perhaps a comparatively late South Indian peculiarity, not met with in Jaffna Tam. where ṯṯ is 'correctly' evaluated as ṯṯ. [See my HAP].

5. The absence of personal endings for tense-forms in Mal. is regarded by some as a relic of "parent Dravidian" which therefore, according to these scholars, confers upon Mal. an

individuality all its own. But, as I have already pointed out above, all the data so far available furnish no positive proof or support for the view that the absence of personal endings in tense-forms was characteristic of the older stages.

On the whole, except for a very few archaisms like the nflexional n'in-, the plural imperatives with vin, ppin, and perhaps constructions like ceyyām and ceyyarudu, the features of Mal. morphology are directly related to, or imnediately derivable from, a stage of speech corresponding to what may now be described as Early Middle Tamil.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Uṇṇunīlisandeśam [ed. by A. K. Pisarodi] US

Līlātilakam [do] L.

Kaṇṇaśśa Rāmāyaṇam KR.

  Bāla kāṇḍam [New Standard Era series]
  Āraṇya [ed. by the Madras University]
  Kiṣkindhā [do]
  Sundara [ed. by Uḷḷūr]
  Uttara [ed. by Pillay]

Kaṇṇaśśa Bhāratam, Part I [Srī Mūlam Gr. series]. KBhr.

,, Bhāgavatam [do] KBhāg.

Niraṇam Bhagavalgīta [ed. by Uḷḷūr] BhG.

Sivarātri Māhātmyam [,,] ŚM.

Rāmakathappāṭṭu [,,] R.

Kṛṣṇagātha [Maṅgaḷōdayam edition] KG.

Ceruśśēri Bhāratam [University selections] CBh.

Rāmacaritam [ed. by Uḷḷūr; ed. by the University] RC

Rāmāyaṇam campu Rām. camp.

  Rāvaṇodbhavam, Sugrīvasakhyam, Vicchinnābhiṣekam, Aṅgulīyāṅgam — [ed. by the Cochin Mal. Improvement Committee]
  Rāmāvatāram, Tāḍakāvadham, Ahalyāmokṣam, Sītāsvayamvaram, Paraśurāmavijayam, Lankāpravēśam, etc. — [Srī Mūlam Granthāvali series]
  Āraṇya and Kiṣkindhā [do.]

Kalyāṇasaugandhikam campu [Srī Mūlam Gr.] Kaly.

Rāvaṇavijayam and Gajēndramōkṣam—campus [ശ്രീമൂലംഗ്രന്ഥാവലി] Rāv.

Rājaratnāvalīyam campu [Maṅgaḷōdayam edition] Rāj.

Kirātam campu [Bhāratavilāsam ed.] K

Naiṣadham campu [Prāñjali edition] Naiṣ.

Kōḍiya Viraham KV

Bhāgavatam Bhāṣā (gadyam) Vols. I and II [Srī Mūlam Gr. series]	BhBh
Bhāgavatam—a few skandhas other than daśama in Prācīna Grantha Mālā [ed. by H. H. Appan Tampurān]	Pr Gr. Bh
Pārvatīpāṇigrahaṇam [Srī Mūlam Gr. series]	Pārv.
Candrōtsavam [ed. by K. S. Menon]	Candr.
Eḷuttaśśan's Bhāratam [Reddiar's edition]	Eḷ Bh
,, Rāmāyaṇam [,,]	Eḷ Rām.
,, Cintāratnam	Cint.
,, Kaivalyan'avan'ītam	Kaivaly
,, Harin'āmakīṛttanam	Harin'ām
Bhāgavatam Kiḷippāṭṭu [Reddiar's edn.]	Bhāg.
Pūndānam's Jñānappāna and Santānagōpālam [Maṅgaḷōdayam]	Pāṭṭ.
Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇām [Bhāratavilāsam].	VR
Mōkṣadāyakam [Srī Mūlam Gr.]	Mōkṣ
Bhīṣmōpadeśam	Bhīṣm.
Kirātāṛjjunīyam [New standard Era series] Kirāt.	Kiḷipp.
Rukmāṅgadacaritam gātha [,,]	Rukm.
Nāgānandam Kiḷippāṭṭu [,,]	Nāg.
Ekādaśi māhātmyam I and II [,,]	Ēkād.
Bharatavākyam [Śrī Mūl. Gr.]	Bharat.
Praiṣam [,,]	Praiṣ.
Koṭṭārakkara Tamburān's Āṭṭakkathagaḷ	Kōttār. Āṭṭ.
Kōṭṭayattu Tamburān's Āṭṭakkathagaḷ	Kōtt. Āṭṭ.
Cāṇakkya Sūtram [Cochin Mal. Improvement Committee]	Cāṇakky.
Kuñjan's Tuḷḷakkathagaḷ [Maṅgaḷōdayam]	Tuḷḷ
Sabhāpṛavēśam പറയൻ തുള്ളൽ	Sabhā
Naḷacaritam Kiḷippāṭṭu	Naḷ. Kiḷipp.
Padin'ālu vṛttam [University selections]	Padin'āl.
Irupattin'ālu vṛttam Bhāgavatam [Cochin Mal. Improvement Committee]	Irupatt. Bhāg
Viṣṇugīta hamsappāṭṭu [Srī Mūlam Gr.]	Viṣṇ.
Girijākalyāṇam [,,]	Girij.
Uṇṇāyi's Naḷacaritam Āṭṭakkatha [University selections]	Naḷ. Āṭṭ.

Rāmapurattu Vāriar's Kucēlavṛttam Vañjippāṭṭu [ed. by Uṇṇi] Kucēl. Vañji.
Kallēṅguḷaññare Vāriar's Vētāḷa caritam [Cochin Mal. Impr. Committee] Vētāḷ.
Kēraḷōlpatti [Basel Mission Press] KU
,, [Bhāratavilāsam Press] KUb
Vaḍakkan Pāṭṭu [Reddiar's edition] VP
Do [Madras University] VPm
Malayāḷattilē Paḻaya Pāṭṭugaḷ [ed. by C. P. G. Pillay] Paḻ. Pāṭṭ
Pāṭṭugaḷ—Vols. I and II—[Maṅgaḷōdayam edn.] Pāṭṭ
Folk-songs [ed. by K. P. Karuppan] Folks.
Malayāḷam Proverbs [Vidyāvilāsa Press edn.] MP
Proverbs in Mal. [compiled by P. Paul] Proverbs
Āṭṭakkathas (in one volume) Āṭṭ
Travancore Archaeological Series [Vols. I to VII] TAS
Cochin Archaeological Reports [Vols. I to VII] CAR
Keraḷa Society Papers [Series 1 to 7] KSP
Journal of the Keraḷa Academy [Vols. I to III] JKA
Maṅgaḷōdayam [Journal] M
Prācīna Grantha Mālā- [ed. by Prince Appan Tampurān] Pr Gr
Kēraḷa Pāṇinīyam [B. V. Book Depot] KP
Malayāḷam Grammar by Gundert [Basel Mission Press]

TAMIL.

Tolkāppiyam Eḻuttu [Śaiva Siddhānta edn.] TE
,, Col. [,,] TC
Vīracōḻiyam [ed. by Damodara Mudaliar] V
Nannūl [ed. by Sāminādayyar] N
Ilakkaṇa Viḷakkam [ed. by Damodara Mudaliar] IV
Puṛanānūṛu [ed. by Sāminādayyar] PN

Kamba Rāmāyaṇam [University selections] Kamb. R.

Tēvāram T

Hymns of Tam. Ṣaivite Saints [Heritage of India series] HTS

South Indian Inscriptions [Govt. of India] SII

Nammāḷvar's Tiruvāymoḷi [Vaiṣṇava Publishing House] NTM

Popes Gr. of the Tamil language.

KANNADA.

Ṣabdamaṇidarpaṇa [ed. by F. Kittel] SM

Grammar of Kannaḍa [by F. Kittel]

MY OWN PAPERS.

Morphology of the Old Tam. Verb ["Anthropos"] MOTV

History of the Tamil-Mal. Alveolar Plosive ["Journal of the Madras University"] HAP

Dravidic Sandhi ["Quarterly Journal of the Mythic Society"] DS

Grammar in Līlātilakam ["Bull. of the Rama Varma Research Institute", 1934] GL

KEY TO THE ABBREVIATIONS OF THE NAMES OF MAL. WORKS.

Bhāg	[ഭാഗവതം കിളിപ്പാട്ട്-ദശമസ്കന്ധം വരെ—Bhāgavatam till Daśama]	
Bhāg. Daś	[ഭാഗവതം ദശമം]	
Bak.	[വടക്കൻ ബകവധം-ആട്ടക്കഥ	Baka Vadham]
Bh Bh	[ഭാഗവതം ഭാഷാ	Bhāgavatam bhāṣā gadyam]
Bharat.	[ഭാരതവാക്യം	Bharatavākyam]
BhG.	[ഭഗവൽഗീതപ്പാട്ട്	Bhagavatgītappāṭṭu]
Bhīṣm.	[ഭീഷ്മോപദേശം	Bhīṣmōpadēśam]
CAR	[Cochin Archaeological Reports]	
Cāṇakky.	[ചാണക്യസൂത്രം	Cāṇakkya Sūtram]
Candr.	[ചന്ദ്രോത്സവം	Candrōtsavam]
CBh	[ചെറുശ്ശേരി ഭാരതം	Ceṛuśśēri Bhāratam]
Cint.	[ചിന്താരത്നം	Cintāratnam]
ElBh	[മഹാഭാരതം കിളിപ്പാട്ട്	Eḻuttaśśan's Bhāratam]
ElRām.	[അദ്ധ്യാത്മരാമായണം കിളിപ്പാട്ട്	Eḻuttaśśan's Rāmāyaṇam]
Ekād.	[ഏകാദശിമാഹാത്മ്യം]	
Folks.	[Malayāḷam Folk-songs compiled by K. P. Karuppan]	
Girij.	[ഗിരിജാകല്യാണം	Uṇṇāyi's Girijākalyāṇam]
Hari.	[ഹരിനാമകീർത്തനം	Harin'āmakīrttanam]
Irupatt. Rām.	[ഇരുപത്തിനാലുവൃത്തം രാമായണം	Irupattin'ālu vṛttam Rāmāyaṇam]
Irupatt. Bhāg.	[ഇരുപത്തിനാലുവൃത്തം ഭാഗവതം	Irupattin'ālu vṛttam Bhāgavatam]
JKA	[സാഹിത്യപരിഷത്ത് ത്രൈമാസിക	Journal of the Kerala Academy]
Kirāt. camp.	[കിരാതം ചമ്പു	Kirātam campu]
Kaivaly.	[കൈവല്യ നവനീതം	Kaivalyan'avan'ītam]

Kaly.	[കല്യാണസൌഗന്ധികം ചമ്പു	Kalyāṇasaugandhikam campu]
Kaly. Āṭṭ.	[വടക്കൻ കല്യാണസൌഗന്ധികം ആട്ടക്കഥ	Vaḍakkan Kalyāṇa Saugandhikam Āṭṭakkatha]
KBhr	[കണ്ണശ്ശഭാരതം	Kaṇṇaśśa Bhāratam]
KBhāg.	[കണ്ണശ്ശഭാഗവതം	
Kirāt.	[കിരാതാർജ്ജുനീയം കിളിപ്പാട്ട്	Kirātārjjunīyam Kiḷippāṭṭu]
KG	[കൃഷ്ണഗാഥ	Kṛṣṇa gātha]
KP	[കേരളപാണിനീയം	Kēraḷa Pāṇinīyam]
KR	[കണ്ണശ്ശ രാമായണം	Kaṇṇaśśa Rāmāyaṇam]
KSP	[Kerala Society Papers]	
KU	[കേരളോല്പത്തി	Keraḷōlpatti]
Kuc. Vañji	[കുചേലവൃത്തം വഞ്ചിപ്പാട്ട്	Kucēlavṛttam Vañjippāṭṭu]
KV	[കൊടിയവിരഹം ചമ്പു	Koḍiyaviraham campu]
Līl.	[ലീലാതിലകം	Līlātilakam]
Maṅg.	[മംഗളോദയം മാസിക	Maṅgaḷōdayam]
Mōkṣ.	[മോക്ഷദായകം	Mōkṣadāyakam]
MP	[മലയാളത്തിലെ പഴഞ്ചൊല്ലുകൾ	Malayāḷam Proverbs Vidyāvilāsam edition]
Naiṣ. camp.	[നൈഷധം ചമ്പു	Naiṣadham campu]
Nāg.	[നാഗാനന്ദം കിളിപ്പാട്ട്	Nāgānandam]
Naḷ. Āṭṭ.	[നളചരിതം ആട്ടക്കഥ	Naḷacaritam Āṭṭakkatha]
Paḍap.	[പടപ്പാട്ട്	Paḍāppāṭṭu]
Pārv.	[പാർവ്വതീ പാണിഗ്രഹണം	Pārvatīpāṇigrahaṇam]
Pāṭṭ.	[പാട്ടുകൾ	Pāṭṭugaḷ—compiled by Yogakṣemam Publishing Co.]
Paḷ. Pāṭṭ.	[മലയാളത്തിലെ പഴയ പാട്ടുകൾ	Malāyāḷattilē Paḷaya Pāṭṭugal edited by C. P. G. Pillay]
Praiṣ.	[പ്രൈഷം	Praiṣam—Srī Mūlam Gr.]
Proverbs	[Proverbs in Mal., compiled by P. Paul]	
Pr. Gr.	[പ്രാചീന ഗ്രന്ഥമാല	Prācīna Grantha Māla]
PT	[പഞ്ചതന്ത്രം	Pancatantram]
R	[രാമകഥപ്പാട്ട്	Rāmakathappāṭṭu]
Rāj.	[രാജരത്നാവലീയം ചമ്പു	Rajaratnāvalīyam campu]

Rām. camp.	[രാമായണം ചമ്പു	Rāmāyaṇam campu]
Rāv.	[രാവണവിജയം ചമ്പു	Rāvaṇa Vijayam campu]
RC.	[രാമചരിതം	Rāma caritam]
Rugm.	[രുഗ്മാംഗദചരിതം ഗാഥ	Rugmāṅgadacaritam]
Sabhā	[സഭാപ്രവേശം—പറയൻ തുള്ളൽ]	
ŚM	[പണിക്കരുടെ ശിവരാത്രി മാഹാത്മ്യം	Niraṇam Sivarātṛi Māhātmyam]
TAS	[Travancore Archaeological Series]	
Tuḷḷ	[നമ്പ്യാരുടെ തുള്ളലുകൾ: ഓട്ടൻതുള്ളലുകൾ, പറയൻതുള്ളലുകൾ and ശീതങ്കൻതുള്ളലുകൾ]	
Vēt	[വേതാള ചരിതം	Vētāḷa caritam]
Viṣṇ.	[വിഷ്ണുഗീത-ഹംസപ്പാട്ട്]	
VP	[വടക്കൻ പാട്ടുകൾ	Vaḍakkan Pāṭṭugaḷ]
VPm	[do.	Madras University edition, Vol. I]
VR	[വാത്മീകി രാമായണം	Keraḷa Varma's Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇam]